

ber 15, 1925; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. FLEETWOOD: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, favoring the repeal of all Federal estate taxation laws for the purpose of leaving this source of revenue to the States alone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEAVITT: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the participation of the United States in the international arbitration conference to be held at Geneva on June 15, 1925; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, opposing a reduction in rates of the duty on linseed oil and flax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HERSEY: A bill (H. R. 12249) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Corliss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 12250) granting an increase of pension to Sophie B. Culbertson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12251) granting an increase of pension to Mollie Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAGON: A bill (H. R. 12252) granting an increase of pension to Felitha Foster; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12253) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. Underhill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SIMMONS: A bill (H. R. 12254) granting an increase of pension to John Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 12255) permitting the sale of lot 9, 16.63 acres, in section 31, township 2 south, range 17 west, Tallahassee meridian, in Bay County, Fla., to P. C. Black; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SWING: A bill (H. R. 12256) for the relief of Rebecca R. Sevier; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TEMPLE: A bill (H. R. 12257) to authorize Dr. L. O. Howard, Chief of the Bureau of Entomology, Department of Agriculture, to accept certain decorations from the French Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12258) for the relief of James H. McLaughlin; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3737. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of George Keller, Hartford, Conn., opposing the present design to be followed in the construction of Arlington Memorial Bridge; to the Committee on the Library.

3738. Also (by request), petition of citizens of Orlington, Calif., opposing the enactment of Senate bill 3218; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3739. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of the Greater Boston Chapter of the General Alumni Association of Howard University, recommending early and favorable consideration of House bill 9635, a bill to federalize Howard University; to the Committee on Education.

3740. By Mr. HAWLEY: Petition of citizens of the State of Oregon to the House of Representatives not to concur in the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218) nor to pass any other religious legislation which may be pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3741. By Mr. HICKEY: Petition of Dr. H. B. Boram, 205 Dean Building, South Bend, Ind., and others, protesting against the Jones Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3742. Also, petition of Mr. R. A. Proctor, 405 North Michigan Street, South Bend, Ind., and others, protesting against the Jones Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3743. By Mr. KELLY: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., opposing changes in transportation act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3744. By Mr. MacLAFFERTY: Petition of citizens of Berkeley and Oakland, Calif., protesting against the passage of the compulsory Sunday observance bill (S. 3218) and any other national religious legislation which may be pending; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3745. By Mr. McREYNOLDS: Petition of citizens of the State of Tennessee, protesting against the passage of Senate bill

3218, compulsory Sunday observance; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3746. By Mr. MOONEY: Petition of the Martha Bolton Club, of Cleveland, Ohio, favoring participation by the United States in the World Court; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3747. Also, petition of the American Association of University Women, Cleveland Branch, favoring participation by the United States in the World Court; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3748. By Mr. MORROW: Petition of New Mexico Wool Growers' Association, in favor of Phipps bill (S. 2424); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3749. Also, petition of the New Mexico Wool Growers' Association, favoring the leasing of the remaining unappropriated public domain; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

3750. Also, petition of the New Mexico Wool Growers' Association, favoring the present tariff schedules on sheep and sheep products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3751. By Mr. O'CONNELL of New York: Petition of Ray P. Holland, editor Field and Stream, favoring the passage of the game refuge bill (H. R. 745); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3752. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring the continuation of naval radio service on Pacific Ocean; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3753. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring the participation of the United States in a World Court; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3754. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring the passage of House bill 11447, with the exception of paragraph 4 of section 4; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3755. By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of the Utz & Dunn Co. and 15 other shoe manufacturing companies of Rochester, N. Y., urging passage of the bill abolishing the surcharge on Pullman fares; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3756. By Mr. SINNOTT: Petition of numerous citizens of the State of Oregon against Senate bill 3218, the compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3757. By Mr. WILLIAMS of Michigan: Petition of Fannie McCormick and 16 other residents of Branch and Hillsdale Counties, Mich., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 3218, the Sunday observance bill, so called; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3758. Also, petition of John R. Carter and 34 other residents of Battle Creek, Mich., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 3218, the Sunday observance bill, so called; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3759. By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Petition of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 3218 or any other compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### SENATE

THURSDAY, February 12, 1925

(Legislative day of Tuesday, February 3, 1925)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

CALF-LEATHER INDUSTRY (S. DOC. NO. 198)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, in response to questions Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, and 15 of Senate Resolution 256, a report of the Department of Commerce on the effect of imports upon the calf-leather industry, and also embodying a report prepared by the United States Tariff Commission in reply to questions 3, 6, 13, 16, and 17. It will lie on the table until action is taken by the Senate.

Mr. COPELAND subsequently said: Mr. President, there was laid before the Senate a few minutes ago and ordered to lie on the table a report from the Commerce Department on the calf-leather industry. I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed as a Senate document, and continue to remain upon the table for further action.

Mr. SMOOT. I did not hear the request of the Senator from New York. What report is it?

Mr. COPELAND. It is the report on the calf-leather industry.

Mr. SMOOT. From what body?

Mr. COPELAND. From the Commerce Department.

Mr. SMOOT. The Commerce Department will have to print the report from its own fund. We appropriate so much money

for each of the bureaus and departments of the Government. If it was in answer to a Senate resolution, of course it could be printed by the Senate.

Mr. COPELAND. It was in answer to a Senate resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. Then I have no objection.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2720. An act to authorize the sale of lands in Pittsburgh, Pa.; and

H. R. 4148. An act to modify and amend the mining laws in their application to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 11280) authorizing the construction of a bridge across Rock River at the city of Beloit, county of Rock, State of Wisconsin, and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The principal legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

|           |                |           |              |
|-----------|----------------|-----------|--------------|
| Ball      | Ferris         | McKinley  | Shortridge   |
| Bayard    | Fletcher       | McLean    | Simmons      |
| Borah     | Frazier        | McNary    | Smith        |
| Brookhart | George         | Mayfield  | Smoot        |
| Broussard | Glass          | Means     | Spencer      |
| Bruce     | Gooding        | Metcalf   | Stanfield    |
| Bursum    | Greene         | Moses     | Stanley      |
| Butler    | Harrell        | Neely     | Sterling     |
| Cameron   | Harris         | Norbeck   | Swanson      |
| Capper    | Heflin         | Norris    | Trammell     |
| Caraway   | Howell         | Oddie     | Underwood    |
| Copeland  | Johnson, Minn. | Pepper    | Walsh, Mass. |
| Couzens   | Jones, N. Mex. | Phippis   | Walsh, Mont. |
| Cummins   | Jones, Wash.   | Pittman   | Warren       |
| Curtis    | Kendrick       | Ransdell  | Watson       |
| Dale      | Keyes          | Reed, Mo. | Weller       |
| Dial      | King           | Robinson  | Wheeler      |
| Dill      | Ladd           | Sheppard  |              |
| Edge      | Lenroot        | Shields   |              |
| Fernald   | McKellar       | Shipstead |              |

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

#### ADDRESS BY DR. JOHN WESLEY HILL ON ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, this is the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. On the last anniversary there was delivered in this city an address by Rev. John Wesley Hill. Doctor Hill is the author of a life of Lincoln, entitled "Lincoln, the Man of God." He is likewise president of the Lincoln Memorial University, located in Cumberland Gap, the purpose of which is the education of the people from whom Abraham Lincoln sprang. I ask unanimous consent that the address of Doctor Hill may be incorporated in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The address is as follows:

#### LINCOLN'S LIVING MEMORIAL

An address by Dr. John Wesley Hill, chancellor, Lincoln Memorial University, at the annual celebration of Lincoln's Birthday, observed by Lincoln Memorial University at the Wardman Park Hotel, February 12, 1924. A presentation of the educational needs of the people of the Appalachian Mountains, the stock from which Lincoln came, and the necessity of the application of the principles of Lincoln to their needs and, indeed, to the needs of the Nation.

Doctor Hill said in part:

"Lincoln Memorial University is the crystallized dream of Abraham Lincoln. It stands at Cumberland Gap, where the States of Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia intersect, as Lincoln's living memorial. It is the educational hope of a vast population of pure-blooded, upstanding, ambitious American mountaineers handicapped with an average illiteracy of 80 per cent.

"Here in the great, prosperous, and progressive North educational institutions and agencies are duplicated and reduplicated into a veritable prodigality of opportunity, but down there in the isolation and solitude of the mountain fastnesses, where rail splitting and mule riding, candle lighting, homespun, and log cabins survive the march of modern civilization, only a crude cabin school here and there dots the broken

landscapes, and the people sit in a gloom upon which the light of knowledge has but dimly dawned. They are a wonderful people—shy, timid, taciturn, hospitable, and adventurous, full of intensity and high daring, the very stuff of which heroes are made.

"We have read the stories of John Fox and others replete with the romance of the mountains, feudal battles, and illicit distilling; the eccentricities, struggles, and heroism of a grim, gaunt, well-nigh mysterious folk, but beneath the romance and tragedy of it all there flows the purest American blood under our flag.

"We have discovered the economic possibilities of the Appalachian region, harnessed its mountain torrents, uncovered its mineral wealth, felled its forests, and surveyed and appraised ever acre of its soil. But in our development of its natural resources we have not taken stock of its 6,000,000 undiluted Americans. We have expended millions upon the Americanization of the foreign born, the uplift of the Sicilian, the Turk, the Greek, the Portuguese, the Pole, the Russian, the refugees from the despotisms of the Old World, and in our zeal for them we have forgotten the children of our own sky and soil and soul. We have substituted the melting pot for the log cabin; we have been so occupied with the millions pouring in upon us from the backyards of Europe that we have forgotten those of our own national household—children of poverty, not the poverty of the Old World, made despicable by centuries of submission to despotism, but the poverty of the New, in which the germ of manhood grows unrestrained by the demands of luxury and untainted by the poison of prodigality.

"Back there, far back in the mountain fastnesses, there is a vast army of American youth dowered with immeasurable possibilities. Why, the soil has scarcely been 'scratched'; it is an illimitable Klondike; mountains of boys and girls awaiting the refining process of education for sublimation into golden citizenship—coming Clays and unrealized Lincolns. Such a mine is worth working. We have waited long enough, alas, too long. This is the decisive moment. National stability is at stake. We are in the midst of the wrecking forces of ignorant, viscous, un-Americanized alienism. The red flag has been lifted; its glow has fallen even upon our National Capitol. Agitators, demagogues, secessionists, and anarchists have joined in a conspiracy to build upon the ruins of our Republic a bolshevistic dynasty.

"Providence has held these mountaineers in reserve. They have functioned magnificently in every national crisis—at Kings Mountain during the Revolution; throughout the War of 1812 and the Civil War, when their loyalty alone held the border States under the flag of the Union; the Spanish-American War and the World War, in which they furnished the greatest hero of the allied armies—Sergeant York.

"We need them right now to reinforce our patriotism, uphold our national ideals, and to protect them from the marauding hosts bearing down upon us from the Old World.

"I saw a cartoon in my boyhood days representing a disheveled, begrimed tramp, standing at the front door of a magnificent mansion in a great city, politely asking the lady of the house for the privilege of stepping into the hall and 'throwing a fit.' These bolshevistic epileptics are pleading with Uncle Sam for the same privilege, and while, to our national humiliation and disgrace, we have in our midst a weak, cowardly, simpering class of citizens who are ready to open our national gateway for the incoming of these undesirables, thank God, in the country I am representing here to-night, the descendants of the Jamestown settlers, with the blood of Washington, Patrick Henry, and 'Light Horse' Harry Lee in their veins, are insisting that America shall never become a seeding ground for the noxious growths of bolshevism and anarchy.

"There is nothing obsolete in these principles; they are instinct with life, applicable to conditions to-day and adapted to all time; not iridescent baubles of political vacuity, but a body of faith, which is the very corner stone of our national life.

"Lincoln is their ideal and they are following in his footsteps. His principles dominate the curriculum of Lincoln Memorial from preparatory to university. Every problem among our students is challenged with the question: 'What would Lincoln say about it if he were here?' And somehow there is a feeling among these people that Lincoln is there; that his spirit broods over the mountains and that his voice may still be heard pleading for the deathless principles for which he lived and died.

"When Lincoln closed his eyes upon the scenes of time Stanton exclaimed, 'Now he belongs to the ages.' He belongs to the ages because he belongs to humanity, because he is the enshrined reality of democracy. It is impossible to think of him in terms of provincialism. He has outgrown all racial, political, and national limitations and towers as a world figure. His cosmic soul 'goes marching on.' His words are a source of inspiration and direction to all who are seeking the way of truth and duty. He belongs to the world, and wherever men are struggling for liberty his name is their guiding star. He sounded the depths of truth, laid bare things vital and fundamental, and to-day his maxims are more potent than those of any other political leader living or dead. There is scarcely a world problem upon which he has not spoken.



"In religion the Bible was the cornerstone of his faith, prayer the atmosphere of his soul. He trusted in God, relied upon Providence, studied the Bible, and followed in the footsteps of the Nazarene.

"In politics he was neither a reactionary nor a revolutionary. He declared that the dogmas of the past are inadequate to the stormy present, warned against 'rashness,' and pleaded for 'sleepless vigilance.' He stood midway between the extremes. He was never a step too late nor a step too soon. He was not a standpatter, but a sure-stepper. He stood for liberty under the law, and only resorted to emancipation as a military necessity. As between communism and capitalism, he stood for the latter. To the Workmen's Association of New York (1864) he said:

"The strongest bond of sympathy outside the family relation should be one uniting all working people; nor should this lead to war upon property or the owners of property."

"And again, warning against anarchy, he said:

"Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him labor diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring himself that his own will be safe from violence when built."

"He warned against revolution, declaring that—

"When reverence for law ceases to prevail in our midst the seed of anarchy will be planted at our doors."

"He stood for law and order, saying:

"He who violates the law tears the charter of his own and his children's liberty."

"Continuing, he exhorted:

"Let reverence for law become the political religion of the nation."

"He was the advance herald of equal suffrage:

"I go for all sharing the ballot, by no means excluding women."

"He was opposed to the socialistic program of government ownership. He said:

"The Government should not attempt to do that which the citizen can do as well for himself or better."

"He glimpsed the program of a world court in his second inaugural, when he closed with the deathless words:

"\* \* \* that we may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

"There is nothing obsolete in these principles; they are instinct with life, applicable to conditions to-day and adapted to all time; not fridescient baubles of political vacuity, but a body of faith, which is the very cornerstone of our national life."

#### THE PRICE OF GASOLINE

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, which I ask may be read and lie on the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 337) was read, as follows:

Whereas during the past two weeks there have throughout the United States been advances in the wholesale and retail price of gasoline, amounting in some of the States to as much as 6 cents a gallon; and

Whereas such enormous increase in the price of this quite generally used product apparently is arbitrarily made and is unwarranted; and

Whereas it is desirable that an inquiry be made to ascertain the cause for such apparently arbitrary and unwarranted increase in the price of gasoline: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Federal Trade Commission be, and it is hereby, directed to investigate the action of the producers and the wholesalers of gasoline, and the retailers thereof, in making such enormous increase in the price of this product; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Federal Trade Commission make investigation and inquiry to ascertain if the producers and wholesalers of gasoline maintain a monopoly or combination in restraint of trade or commerce and in violation of law; be it further

*Resolved*, That the said commission shall make such investigation hereby directed with reasonable dispatch and report to the Senate the results of such investigation; and be it further

*Resolved*, That should it be determined that the producers and sellers maintain a monopoly or combine in violation of law, that the commission shall proceed forthwith by appropriate action for the punishment of such monopoly or trust and the dissolution thereof.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will lie on the table.

#### ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, to-day is the birthday of the immortal Abraham Lincoln, and I desire to submit a few remarks on his life and character.

In a small Indiana town, not far from Evansville, sleeps one of America's heroines. Her passing was a tragedy in the wilderness—the first great tragedy that came into the life of her noble son. On a simple and modest granite column are these words:

Nancy Hanks Lincoln, mother of Abraham Lincoln, died Oct. 5, 1818, aged 35 years.

She was buried in a forest, under a spreading and majestic sycamore. When all was over, a lad of 11 sat alone on the mound of fresh earth until the shadows grew deep and dark; and wept his first bitter tears.

Eleven years later, when the lad, now grown to early manhood, moved west into Illinois, he put on a wooden slab the initials "N. H. L." and placed it securely at the head of the grave, now almost obliterated.

In 1876 James Studebaker, of South Bend, bought a marble headstone and placed it on the grave, and built a fence around the sacred spot.

In 1905 a few citizens of Indiana bought the hilltop, a beautiful grove of 30 acres, and gave it to the State of Indiana forever. Now it is called Nancy Hanks Park, with well-trimmed trees, winding walks, and well-kept roads. It is the mecca of thousands who come to pay homage to motherhood and a noble soul.

On this tomb are four words—the most precious tribute tongue can tell or pen can write:

Mother of Abraham Lincoln.

"All I am and all I hope to be I owe to my dear mother," wrote Abraham Lincoln years later. The mothers of such as Lincoln too often are forgotten!

Abraham Lincoln doubtless has been the subject of more literary composition than any other man of modern times. In the Congressional Library alone are more than 3,000 volumes—histories, memorials, biographies, anecdotes, speeches, and tender tributes of this remarkable man. More than half a century has passed since his final martyrdom, yet he stands out among America's great, perhaps the greatest of all. There is no other man in all human history whose reputation is more firmly and clearly established. Certainly there is none more beloved and revered, whose character is so universally admired and whose benign influence has dwelt so long among men. It will never die. About him the last word never can be said. Each succeeding generation will profit by his life and his example and grow through the power of his spirit to the end of time.

The story of his life from poverty to exalted power among men is well known to all. The question that most concerns us is this: "Whence came the remarkable qualities of this man? Wherein was he great? How did it happen that a poor and humble country lawyer and local politician suddenly took his place with the world's greatest statesmen and solved problems that staggered the wisest minds of the Nation?"

Such men are not accidents. Abraham Lincoln, all unconscious of his sublime destiny, by his early struggles and privations, was qualified for the task to which Infinite Wisdom had assigned him. The Almighty chooses the humblest for his greatest work.

None now scruple to call Abraham Lincoln great. By some strange fortune it fell to his lot to achieve results hitherto declared possible only to the highest order of genius and faculty. He was history's most startling wonder. Outwardly an ordinary man, he wrought the most extraordinary things in a sphere of action where personal character and official influence were subject to the severest test. He had not the stern dignity of Washington nor the brilliancy of Hamilton, nor the versatility of John Quincy Adams, nor the finished eloquence of Everett, nor the majesty of Webster. Yet there was in him that which, when measured by results, prove him inferior to none of these illustrious men.

He pretended nothing he did not possess. His simplicity, his candor, his common sense baffled his critics. The ease with which he mastered the most intricate problems of his time deceived all save those nearest to him. He did not claim eloquence, yet his simplest passages were most eloquent. His utterances are immortal; the world will never forget them.

His gentleness and humanity were proverbial. Mistaken for weakness, they were springs of strength and character. Amid the strifes and struggles of a period of tumult and revolution he maintained a calm and self-control unparalleled.

Tested by all the measures of greatness, he met them all. He did not abuse his power. No one in high office so scrupulously marked the limitations of authority or more reluctantly exceeded them in time of national peril. As a leader he took all possible hazards and won. He encountered difficulties that would have overwhelmed a less patient, confident, and devout man. He molded the minds and character of a free people as few before him have done. He won and held the confidence of the people; the people surrendered to him their lives and fortunes without complaint. He enriched the history of a people and multiplied their traditions of endurance, heroism, and patriotism. He lived a life of service and sealed it in a

martyr's death. The Nation lost the mortal Lincoln; it gained the immortal Lincoln.

In a memorial sermon delivered soon after Mr. Lincoln's death, the eloquent Henry Ward Beecher, who did so much to uphold the hand of President Lincoln, said:

And now the martyr is moving in triumphal march, mightier than when alive. The Nation rises up at every stage of his coming. Cities and States are his pallbearers, and the cannon beats the hours with solemn progression. Dead, he yet speaketh. \* \* \* Disinherited of flesh and risen in the unobstructed sphere where passion never comes, he begins his illimitable work. His life now is grafted upon the infinite and will be fruitful as no earthly life can be. \* \* \* In the midst of this great continent his dust shall rest, a sacred treasure to myriads who shall pilgrim to that shrine to kindle anew their zeal and patriotism.

Abraham Lincoln is remembered not so much for his intellect as for his character. In his historic debates with Stephen A. Douglas he met an antagonist possessing a keen intellect but lacking in moral power. As a pure contest of wits Mr. Douglas was not much inferior to Mr. Lincoln, but Mr. Lincoln triumphed in the forum of public opinion because back of his logic and argument was a moral force, a lofty character, that appealed to the hearts and the souls of liberty-loving Americans.

In his immortal inaugural addresses and his Gettysburg address Abraham Lincoln revealed not only grandeur of thought but tenderness of heart. So long as this Republic shall endure, the words of Abraham Lincoln will be the Nation's heritage and inspiration:

We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies. Though passion may have strained, it must not break the bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory stretching from every patriot grave to every living heart and hearthstone all over this broad land will yet swell the chorus of the Union when again touched, as surely they will be, by the better angels of our nature.

\* \* \* \* \*

With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who has borne the battle, and for his widow and orphan; to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

\* \* \* \* \*

The world will little note nor long remember what we say here, but it never can forget what they did here. \* \* \* It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion; that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain; that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom.

Washington and Lincoln are the two outstanding figures in American history. Both faced great crises—the one to create a nation, the other to preserve a nation. As to which faced the greater task it may not be for us to judge. Read what Mr. Lincoln said and thought. When bidding his friends and neighbors in Springfield, Ill., farewell upon his departure for Washington, he said:

I now leave, not knowing when or whether ever I may return, with a task before me greater than that which rested upon Washington.

Under the weight of all but killing responsibilities President Lincoln's religious character was revealed. No President ever faced a situation of greater difficulty, of deeper discouragement.

I am driven to my knees—

He said—

because there is nowhere else to go.

The ship of state was plunging in a raging storm, with dangers on every side and men's hearts failing for fear. Jealousies in his own political household and unfriendliness of foreign powers were perplexing and menacing. They added to President Lincoln's burden of anxiety at a time when reverses to the Union Army sorely depressed his spirits. One general after another failed to win decisive victories. Terrible losses were suffered by the Union troops, which sent a wave of discouragement over the loyal section of the country, while unfriendly verdicts at the polls seared his heart and soul.

The firmness of Mr. Lincoln, his confidence and hopefulness when the outlook was the darkest and when the cry of "Peace at any price" was loudest, were due to his unwavering reliance on and clinging faith in an overruling Providence. His faith was justified, his prayers answered on the field of Gettys-

burg. At Appomattox the "Better angels of our nature" ended the struggle. The Nation was saved. Abraham Lincoln wore a new "expression of serene joy, as if conscious that the great purpose of his life had been achieved."

What are some of the lessons from the life of this great American?

He who can master his conditions, instead of being overwhelmed by them, has won half the battle. He who is a victim of his conditions and surroundings, with no ability or power, has lost the battle already.

Abraham Lincoln was closely in touch with the common people, the common thought, the common life. He was one of the common people. His homely philosophy, his apt illustrations, made him the idol of the masses. His political and social ideas were sound. His influence with the masses was moral and righteous. With such an influence comes power.

Abraham Lincoln was honest in his personal character, honest in his professional character, and honest in his political character. He never took a law case that he did not believe was right.

It is worthy of note that Abraham Lincoln possessed a keen sense of humor. He said that "the man who can smile at his own discomfort, at disasters that come to himself, is safe." Often criticized for indulging in humor, Lincoln replied: "If I could not laugh I would die." A strange statement for this sad and melancholy man to make; yet Lincoln's humor gave him relief in the midst of the great stress and burden of public affairs.

Much has been written on the question: "Was Lincoln a religious man?" If we measure him by the standard of goodness, of devotion to his fellow men, of consecration to high ideals, of service to humanity, of his unselfishness and magnanimity—then he was most magnificently religious.

In these days of political and social experiments, it seems quite the fashion for some to quote from the words of Abraham Lincoln in support of so-called "progressive doctrines." Yet perhaps the two essentials of Mr. Lincoln's political principles were, first, obedience to law; second, reverence for the Constitution of the United States. At the age of 26, in an address at Springfield, Ill., he said:

Let reverence for the law be breathed by every American mother to the babe that prattles on her lap. Let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges. Let it be written in primers, spelling books, and almanacs. Let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. In short, let it become the political religion of the Nation.

Not infrequently efforts have been launched to make it appear that Mr. Lincoln's faith in the Constitution and the judiciary was shaken by the famous Dred Scott decision. Nay, it is asserted that Mr. Lincoln even favored a popular review or congressional review of judicial decisions. This is a mistake. Mr. Lincoln realized that respect for the Supreme Court and the judiciary was necessary to maintain the Government; and whenever decisions on constitutional grounds appeared to be wrong, the only remedy was a change in the membership of the court, or an arousal of public opinion against what appears to be a manifestly wrong view. At all times, he said, the judiciary should be upheld. Certainly Mr. Lincoln never favored a popular or congressional referendum of a decision of the Supreme Court. It meant destruction of the Constitution.

Nor did Mr. Lincoln for one moment depart from the great purpose of his life—the preservation of the Union. It is well for those who regret the growth of the national spirit to recall this. If nationalism departs from this Republic, disintegration and decay will follow speedily. The national spirit touches the heart strings, inspires patriotism, and gives spiritual power to the melodies of the Republic. Abraham Lincoln never lost sight of the Union and the Nation. At Gettysburg he appealed to his countrymen to resolve "that this Nation shall have a new birth of freedom." In his second inaugural he appealed to his countrymen "to bind up the Nation's wounds." His martyrdom was a sacrifice for the Nation. Without nationalism his whole life and work would be in vain.

Some claim that Abraham Lincoln was an "independent" in politics, thus rejecting political-party authority and regularity. On the contrary, he believed in party discipline. He held that the Government of the United States is a political organization, and that the political opinions and activities of those entrusted with its administration in critical days are as much of consequence as integrity and intelligence. He made his appointments from among those who believed in the principles



and the measures of the party with which he was identified. He believed in majority rule within the party.

The Republic was passing through a moral and spiritual revival when Abraham Lincoln appeared in the great drama. Again the Nation feels the touch of moral and spiritual forces in a mighty struggle against materialism.

At the dedication of the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, May 30, 1922, the late President Harding said:

In every moment of peril, in every hour of discouragement, whenever the clouds gather, there is the image of Lincoln to rivet our hopes and to renew our faith. Whenever there is a glow of triumph over our national achievement, there comes the reminder that but for Lincoln's heroic and unalterable faith in the Union these triumphs could not have been.

Before the Holy Name Society in Washington, September 21, last, President Coolidge said:

We Americans are idealists. We are willing to follow the truth because it is the truth. We put our main emphasis on the things which are spiritual. We use wealth as a means to a higher life. . . . The tall shaft near which we are gathered, and yonder stately memorial, remind us that our standards of manhood are revealed in the adoration which we pay to Washington and Lincoln. They are unrivaled and unsurpassed. Above all else, they are Americans.

In an address in New York City, February 12, 1924, President Coolidge said:

To me the greatness of Lincoln consisted very largely of a vision by which he saw more clearly than the men of his time the moral relationship of things. . . . He was a great moral force.

Only the matchless Nazarene can be compared with Abraham Lincoln. The greatest President, powerful and strong—

Yet he was humble, kind, forgiving, mild,  
And with all patience and affection taught,  
Rebuked, persuaded, solaced, counseled, warned,  
In fervent style and manner. Needy poor  
And dying men, like music, heard his feet  
Approach their beds, and guilty wretches took  
New hope, and in his prayers wept and smiled  
And blessed him as they died forgiven; and all  
In his face contentment, in his life  
The path to glory and perpetual joy.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. JOHNSON of Minnesota presented the memorials of Mrs. A. Stremow and 216 other citizens of Wheaton and of D. E. Ward and 36 other citizens of St. Paul, all in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called compulsory Sunday observance bill for the District, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAPPER presented the memorial of the Hub Clothing Co. and sundry other business firms of Dodge City, Kans., remonstrating against the passage of legislation increasing postal rates and changing the zone system, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. FRAZIER presented the memorials of L. G. Brown and 24 other citizens of Billings County and of Fred Laesle and 94 other citizens of Napoleon, all in the State of North Dakota, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called compulsory Sunday observance bill for the District, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BROOKHART presented the petition of Nellie E. Hotchkiss, president of the Women's Club, and sundry other clubs and citizens of Adel, Iowa, praying for the participation of the United States in the World Court under the terms of the so-called Harding-Hughes plan, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, favoring the passage of the so-called migratory bird bill, for the protection of migratory birds, water fowl, fur-bearing animals, and fishes, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE presented memorials numerously signed by sundry citizens of Arlington, Chula Vista, Glendale, Grass Valley, Los Angeles, Paso Robles, San Diego, and Hughson, all in the State of California, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called compulsory Sunday observance bill for the District of Columbia, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Junior League of the Contemporary Club, of Redlands, Calif., favoring the entrance of the United States into the World Court upon the terms of the so-called Harding-Hughes plan, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Aviation Club, of Superior, Calif., favoring the passage of legislation to combine the air services into a separate department for the national defense with a secretary in the President's Cabinet, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the petition of Harry Benton Clark, of San Francisco, Calif., praying for the passage of legislation designating a day as a national holiday to be observed as School Children's Public Parade Day throughout the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. KENDRICK, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, to which was referred the bill (S. 4254) for the relief of Ishmael J. Barnes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1087) thereon.

Mr. BALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12002) to establish a Board of Public Welfare in and for the District of Columbia, to determine its functions, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1088) thereon.

Mr. HEFLIN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 3107) to amend the United States cotton futures act, as amended, reported it with amendments.

Mr. FERNALD, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11791) to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1089) thereon.

Mr. BRUCE, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 2253) for the relief of the P. Dougherty Co., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1090) thereon.

Mr. FERRIS, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9537) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to transfer to the city of Port Huron, Mich., a portion of the Fort Gratiot Lighthouse Reservation, Mich., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1091) thereon.

Mr. LADD, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 4225) to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Detroit River within or near the city limits of Detroit, Mich., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1092) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 4209) to authorize the building of a bridge across the Santee River in South Carolina (Rept. No. 1093);

A bill (S. 4210) to authorize the building of a bridge across the Congaree River in South Carolina (Rept. No. 1094);

A bill (S. 4211) to authorize the building of a bridge across the Catawba River in South Carolina (Rept. No. 1095);

A bill (S. 4212) to authorize the building of a bridge across the Broad River in South Carolina (Rept. No. 1096);

A bill (S. 4213) to authorize the building of a bridge across the Santee River in South Carolina (Rept. No. 1097);

A bill (S. 4214) to authorize the building of a bridge across the Savannah River between South Carolina and Georgia (Rept. No. 1098); and

A bill (S. 4217) granting the consent of Congress to the Susquehanna Bridge Co. and its successors to construct a bridge across the Susquehanna River between the borough of Wrightsville, in York County, Pa., and the borough of Columbia, in Lancaster County, Pa. (Rept. No. 1099).

Mr. LADD also, from the Committee on Commerce, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 10412) granting the consent of Congress to the Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Co., its successors and assigns, to construct a bridge across the Little Calumet River (Rept. No. 1101); and

A bill (H. R. 10596) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a dam across the Red River of the North (Rept. No. 1102).

#### INVESTIGATION OF CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES (REPT. NO. 1100)

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire, as chairman of the special committee under Senate Resolution 248, to submit a report which I send to the desk and ask that it may be printed.

I have here the testimony complete which was taken by the committee, but the committee have not thought that it would be necessary to print the testimony. It would be quite expensive to do so. But they ask permission to file it with the Secretary

of the Senate in its typewritten form so that it may be there for consultation if anyone desires to consult it.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Will the Senator state what the report is?

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator mean as to the details?

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. No; the title; the subject matter.

Mr. BORAH. The report is under Senate Resolution 248, wherein there was provided a special committee to investigate campaign expenditures. The report undertakes to give the amount collected by the parties, the amount expended, and the list of those contributing over \$1,000. It then recommends certain matters with reference to legislation.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. There is a recommendation of legislation?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON. The report will be printed?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I ask that the report be printed, and when the report has been printed I think it would be well to refer it to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LADD in the chair). Without objection, the report will be printed, and it will be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mr. WATSON, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on February 11, 1925, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 3722) to authorize the State of Indiana, and the State of Illinois, to construct a bridge across the Wabash River at the city of Vincennes, Knox County, Ind.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 4287) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to prepare a medal with appropriate emblems and inscriptions commemorative of the Fort Vancouver Centennial; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 4288) granting a pension to Mary J. Walters (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 4289) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Colorado River near Blythe, Calif.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 4290) for the relief of William Eckman; and

A bill (S. 4291) to extend the provisions of the United States employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to James E. Dethlefsen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRIS:

A bill (S. 4292) granting a pension to Eugene A. Rentz; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 4293) authorizing the acceptance from the Georgia Society Colonial Dames of America of a conveyance of the title to Fort Frederica, St. Simon Island, Ga., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURSUM:

A bill (S. 4294) granting a pension to John Mosley;

A bill (S. 4295) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Reynolds;

A bill (S. 4296) granting an increase of pension to Grace L. Brewer; and

A bill (S. 4297) granting an increase of pension to Edward Purdy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRUCE:

A bill (S. 4298) granting a pension to Jennie R. Dorsey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COPELAND:

A bill (S. 4299) granting an increase of pension to Georgiana R. Shaw; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A bill (S. 4300) to create a Federal cooperative marketing board, to provide for the registration of cooperative marketing, clearing-house, and terminal-market organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

A bill (S. 4301) authorizing any tribe or band of Indians of California to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Missouri:

A bill (S. 4302) incorporating the Imperial Council of the Ancient Arabic Order of the Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### SESQUICENTENNIAL OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE

On motion of Mr. COPELAND and by unanimous consent, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 166) authorizing the establishment of a commission to be known as the sesquicentennial of American independence and the Thomas Jefferson centennial commission of the United States, in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the one hundredth anniversary of the death of Thomas Jefferson, the author of that immortal document, which had been reported from the Committee on the Library, was taken from the calendar and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by title and referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining:

H. R. 2720. An act to authorize the sale of lands in Pittsburgh, Pa.; and

H. R. 4148. An act to modify and amend the mining laws in their application to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes.

#### PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, announced that on February 10, 1925, the President approved and signed an act (S. 353) for the relief of Reuben R. Hunter.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11753) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes, requested a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. SHREVE, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. OLIVER of Alabama were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

#### STEAMSHIPS "CEYLON MARU" AND "COMANCHE" AND BARGE "ANODE"

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHORTRIDGE in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 84) for the relief of the owners of the steamship *Ceylon Maru*, which was, on page 2, line 2, to strike out "including interest."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, there are three bills from the House of the same nature on the desk, with the same amendment, which reduces the amount the claimant is to receive. I ask that they may receive immediate consideration.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I will ask my friend from Alabama if these are matters which will lead to any extended debate?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. None at all. If they do, I will withdraw them. As the bills passed the Senate they allowed interest. The House strikes out the allowance of interest and reduces the amount.

Mr. WARREN. They are measures of economy, then.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes. There can be no objection to it except on the part of the men who are getting the relief.

I ask to have the action of the House on the other two bills laid before the Senate, and then I will ask unanimous consent for action upon the House amendments to the three bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER also laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 82) for the relief of the owners of the steamship *Comanche*, which was, on page 2, line 1, to strike out "including interest."

He also laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 78) for the relief of the owners of the barge *Anode*, which was, on page 2, line 1, to strike out "including interest."

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask unanimous consent that the House amendments to all three bills be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the amendments of the House be agreed to. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, with the permission of the chairman of the committee I desire to submit a conference report, and then I shall ask for its present consideration. In explanation of the report I will state that it is on the Interior Department appropriation bill, and every item except three has been agreed to in conference. This is only a partial report. The conferees on the part of the House will take back



those three items for a vote in the House before a final vote is had upon the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read the report.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10020) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 23, 31, 36, 45, and 49.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 29, 39, 40, 41, 42, 46, 47, and 48, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "not to exceed \$2,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "\$35,000, of which \$10,000 shall be available only for the completion of the Taber feed canal"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for construction purposes until a contract or contracts in form approved by the Secretary of the Interior shall have been made with an irrigation district or with irrigation districts organized under State law, providing for payment by the district or districts as hereinafter provided. The Secretary of the Interior shall by public notice announce the date when water is available under the project: *Provided further*, That no part of the sum hereby appropriated shall be expended for the construction of new canals or for the extension of the present canal system for the irrigation of lands outside of the 40,000 acres for the irrigation of which a canal system is now provided, until a contract or contracts shall have been executed between the United States and the State of Montana, whereby the State shall assume the duty and responsibility of promoting the development and settlement of the project after completion, securing, selecting, and financing of settlers to enable the purchase of the required livestock, equipment, and supplies and the improvement of the lands to render them habitable and productive. The State shall provide the funds necessary for this purpose and shall conduct operations in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That the operation and maintenance charges on account of land in this project shall be paid annually in advance not later than March 1, no charge being made for operation and maintenance for the first year after said public notice. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to give such public notice when water is actually available for such lands"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "to remain available until December 31, 1925"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: " : *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for construction purposes until a contract or contracts in form approved by the Secretary of the Interior shall have been made with an irrigation district or with irrigation districts organized under State law, or water users' association or associations, providing for payment by the district or districts, or water users' association or associations, as hereinafter provided: *Provided further*, That the operation and maintenance charges on account of land in this

project shall be paid annually in advance not later than March 1, no charge being made for operation and maintenance for the first year after said public notice. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to give such public notice when water is actually available for such lands"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: " : *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for construction purposes until a contract or contracts in form approved by the Secretary of the Interior shall have been made with an irrigation district or with irrigation districts organized under State laws providing for payment by the district or districts as hereinafter provided. The Secretary of the Interior shall by public notice announce the date when water is available under the project: *Provided further*, That no part of the sum provided for herein shall be expended for construction on account of any lands in private ownership until an appropriate repayment contract, in form approved by the Secretary of the Interior shall have been properly executed by a district organized under State law, embracing the lands in public or private ownership irrigable under the project, and the execution thereof shall have been confirmed by decree of a court of competent jurisdiction, which contract, among other things, shall contain a provision for an appraisal, showing the present actual bona fide value of all such irrigable lands fixed without reference to the proposed construction of said Kittitas division, and shall provide that until one-half the construction charges against said lands shall have been fully paid no sale of any such lands shall be valid unless and until the purchase price involved in such sale is approved by the Secretary of the Interior, and shall also provide that upon proof of fraudulent representation as to the true consideration involved in any such sale the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cancel the water right attaching to the land involved in such fraudulent sale; and all public lands irrigable under the project shall be entered subject to the conditions of this section which shall be applicable thereto: *Provided further*, That no part of the sum hereby appropriated shall be expended for construction until a contract or contracts shall have been executed between the United States and the State of Washington pursuant to its land settlement act embodied in chapter 188, laws of 1919, as amended by chapter 90, laws of 1921, and by chapters 34 and 112, laws of 1923, or additional enactments, if necessary, whereby the State shall assume the duty and responsibility of promoting the development and settlement of the project after completion, including the subdivision of lands held in private ownership by any individual in excess of 160 irrigable acres, the securing, selection, and financing of settlers to enable the purchase of the required livestock, equipment and supplies, and the improvement of the lands to render them habitable and productive. The State shall provide the funds necessary for this purpose and shall conduct operations in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That the operation and maintenance charges on account of land in this project shall be paid annually in advance not later than March 1, no charge being made for operation and maintenance for the first year after said public notice. It shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to give such public notice when water is actually available for such lands"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 10 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the words "until used"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have not agreed on amendments numbered 27, 30, 34, 37, 38, 43, 44, and 50.

REED SMOOT,  
CHARLES CURTIS,  
WM. J. HARRIS,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

LOUIS C. CRAMTON,  
FRANK MURPHY,  
C. D. CARTER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. SMOOT. I move that the report be adopted. I am anxious to get action on it so that it can be gotten over to the other House. They would like to have it there as quickly as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report of the conferees.  
The report was agreed to.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11505) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, when the recess was taken last night we had reached page 7 of the bill in the reading at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment found on page 7, beginning at line 6.

The PRINCIPAL LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 6, before the words "of which," it is proposed to strike out "\$26,000" and insert "\$32,000," so as to read:

For examination of presidential postmasters, including travel, stationery, contingent expenses, additional examiners and investigators, and other necessary expenses of examinations, \$32,000, of which amount, etc.

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. In this amendment there is an increase of \$6,000 provided for over the House provision. What is that intended for? Is it to give additional investigators?

Mr. WARREN. It covers the matter of the examination of postmasters. The sum has been cut down from year to year from \$175,000 to this amount shown, which will be only \$32,000 with the \$6,000 added.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does it come within the Budget estimate?

Mr. WARREN. The full amount was recommended to the Budget, but the Budget thought that they could cut the amount. Afterwards they realized that they had made a mistake, and from the inquiry I made it seemed necessary to add the \$6,000.

Mr. FLETCHER. It refers to expenses generally, without reference to engaging an additional force, increasing the personnel?

Mr. WARREN. On the nomination or employment of postmasters, unless they are already in office, they must be examined according to the rules of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand that; but I did not know but that this was to add more examiners.

Mr. WARREN. It is a very small sum, considering what we started with. This is the fourth year, and there will be new appointments and reappointments. I hope the Senator will not make any objection to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, on line 7 I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The PRINCIPAL LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "\$20,880" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$26,880," so as to read:

Of which amount not to exceed \$26,880 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment was, on page 8, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "\$21,875" and insert "\$24,592," so as to read:

For rent of building for the Civil Service Commission, \$24,592, if space can not be assigned by the Public Buildings Commission in other buildings under the control of that commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

#### SHENANDOAH VALLEY AND SMOKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, Senate bill 4109, relative to the acquirement of national parks, to be known as Shenandoah National Park and Smoky Mountain National Park, has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys of the Senate, and a similar bill has also been reported to the House, and may be considered in the House next Monday, I understand. It is very important, in order that the bill may be passed at this session, to get action on it at once, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. WARREN. I realize that it is necessary to get some of these matters before the House at an early date, and if it will lead to no debate, I shall have no objection.

Mr. SWANSON. I ask that the appropriation bill be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 4109.

Mr. CURTIS. What does the bill provide for?

Mr. SWANSON. It is a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to appoint a commission to survey the lands in the Shenandoah Valley in order to establish a park area. It also includes the Smoky Mountain National Park and the Mammoth Cave National Park.

Mr. CURTIS. Does it make an appropriation or authorize one?

Mr. SWANSON. It authorizes the appropriation of \$20,000. The Budget Bureau has estimated for it. It provides for three surveys and for a report to Congress.

Mr. CURTIS. I have no objection to the bill.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It has the approval of the Budget Bureau and of the President.

Mr. SWANSON. It is designed to make a survey and ascertain the conditions, costs, and advantages which would accrue naturally if one or more parks were created in the designated area. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. I desire to say that it has the approval of all the Senators from the territory embraced within the contemplated parks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 4109, relative to the acquirement of national parks, to be known as Shenandoah National Park and Smoky Mountain National Park. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SWANSON. I desire to offer an amendment. The House committee has reported a bill on which all interested in the territory involved have agreed, and I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and to insert the text of the House bill, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia moves that all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill be stricken out and that the language found in House bill 11980 be substituted in lieu thereof. The Secretary will read the proposed amendment.

The PRINCIPAL LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to determine the boundaries and area of such portion of the Blue Ridge Mountains of Virginia lying east of the South Fork of the Shenandoah River and between Front Royal on the north and Waynesboro on the south as may be recommended by him to be acquired and administered as a national park, to be known as the Shenandoah National Park, and such portion of the Smoky Mountains lying in Tennessee and North Carolina as may be recommended by him to be acquired and administered as a national park, to be known as the Smoky Mountains National Park, and in the Mammoth Cave regions of Kentucky, and also such other lands in the southern Appalachian Mountains as in his judgment should be acquired and administered as national parks, and to receive definite offers of donations of lands and moneys, and to secure such options as in his judgment may be considered reasonable and just for the purchase of lands within said boundaries, and to report to Congress thereon: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, appoint a commission of five members, composed of a representative of the Interior Department and four national park experts, said four members to serve without compensation.

SEC. 2. A sum sufficient to secure options and to pay the necessary expenses of the commission in carrying out the provisions of this act, including the salary of one clerk to the commission at a rate not to exceed \$2,000 per annum, necessary traveling expenses of the members of the commission, and \$10 per diem in lieu of actual cost of subsistence, in all not to exceed \$20,000, is hereby authorized to be appropriated.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the text of the House bill differ from that of the Senate bill?

Mr. SWANSON. It is different to the extent that the House bill includes the Mammoth Cave region. The two bills are practically the same. There is a provision for an investigation of the Smoky Mountain region and for an investigation of the Shenandoah region. Then, the House bill provides for an investigation of the Mammoth Cave region, and that there shall be a report to Congress. The bill authorizes an appropriation of \$20,000. The only difference is that the bill as originally introduced in the Senate provided simply for an



appropriation of \$15,000. There has been an additional Budget estimate of \$5,000 to cover an investigation of the Mammoth Cave section, the report of the commission to include that region also, if the appropriation shall be made.

Mr. SMOOT. The bill has not passed the House?

Mr. SWANSON. It has not passed the House, but it may come up Monday in the House.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator is offering an amendment to the Senate bill containing the provisions of the House bill?

Mr. SWANSON. To insert the language of the House bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SWANSON. I desire to have the title amended to conform with the amendment made.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the securing of lands in the southern Appalachian Mountains and in the Mammoth Cave regions of Kentucky for perpetual preservation as national parks."

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11505) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Smithsonian Institution," subhead "National Museum," on page 23, line 4, before the words "of which," to strike out "\$74,560" and insert "\$77,560," and in line 5, before the word "may," to strike out "\$40,780," and insert "\$41,580," so as to read:

For heating, lighting, electrical, telegraphic, and telephonic service, \$77,560, of which amount not to exceed \$41,580 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 21, page 23.

Mr. WARREN. I send to the desk an amendment at this point in the bill which I ask to have agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The PRINCIPAL LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 23, line 21, strike out "\$551,392" and insert in lieu thereof "\$554,392," so as to read:

In all, National Museum, \$554,392.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. I understand the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee is to increase the appropriation?

Mr. WARREN. It is simply to correct the total on account of the amendments agreed to in lines 4 and 5.

Mr. KING. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee, in view of some inquiries which have been addressed to me recently, whether the appropriation for the National Museum brings any corresponding benefit. There has been some criticism as to its efficiency, indeed as to its necessity. I express no opinion. One letter which I received stated that unless we had a museum of large proportions supported by gifts and benefactions from private individuals as well as from the Government it would be better to have none at all. New York City, as we all know, is building up very fine institutions, picture galleries, and museums. The same is true of Chicago, Philadelphia, and other large cities.

I express no opinion as to the propriety and wisdom of the Government of the United States establishing in Washington a national museum. If we are going to embark upon the undertaking, it will call for millions of dollars, and each year additional appropriations. To have an unimportant, insignificant museum in the Capital of the National does not appeal to me. We ought either to have a museum worthy of the name or have none at all.

Mr. WARREN. We have the latest addition to the faculty of the museum present in the person of the Senator's colleague, and perhaps he will give us some information on the question propounded by the junior Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to my colleague that there is no American who comes to Washington and goes to our National Museum who is not greatly surprised to find that we have not an arts building in connection with that great institution. Mr. Freer gave a wonderful collection

and provided a building in which to house it, of which the American people are greatly appreciative. I am in favor of erecting an arts building. I will say to the Senate right now that I know of three of the best collections of art in the United States which would be willed to the arts institution if we had an arts building capable of holding those wonderful art collections. Such a building is going to come, in my opinion, but it ought to come at an early date.

The institution is at the present time undertaking to collect a million dollars by donations from individuals in the United States for a certain purpose. I am in hopes that the undertaking will be successful. The Senator, I am quite aware, is acquainted with the history of the development of the Smithsonian Institution. The interest that the institution receives annually from the original donation by Mr. Smithson, of England, amounts to about \$60,000. The only objects of art which we now have in the museum are those which have been donated by individuals; and I wish to say frankly that if the Senator will take the time some day to go through the entire building he will find some really remarkable paintings which are stored away in various portions of the building. The institution has no place in which to exhibit those paintings. It is really a crime, I was going to say, that those paintings are not in a position so that the American people might see them. As I have said, if we had a new building we should have one of the best art collections in all the world within a very few years, not by purchase but by gift. There is, however, at present no incentive for donations to the Government by wealthy art collectors. A wealthy woman said to me the other day when I was talking to her about the matter, "What is the use of my putting in my will a provision bequeathing my art collection to the Smithsonian Institution when that institution has not a foot of space in which to take care of it?" And I could not deny the truth of her statement.

Mr. SMITH. What is the amount of the appropriation for this purpose?

Mr. SMOOT. There is no appropriation for an art building about which the Senator asked me.

Mr. KING. The appropriation in this instance amounts to more than \$400,000. May I say to my colleague that I share the view which he expresses, namely, that we should have a suitable art gallery and museum here in the Capital of the Nation. That is what I am inquiring about. The complaints which have come to me have been that we either ought to have a suitable building or we ought to have none at all; that the Congress ought to provide a plan for the erection of a suitable building and to establish a national museum and art gallery that would be commensurate with the power and, I hope, with the culture—

Mr. SMOOT. And the dignity.

Mr. KING. And the ideals of the American people. If we can not do that, I think we shall be wasting some of the money.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to say that the Smithsonian Institution has at the present time the drawings of just such a building, and a wonderfully suitable location for it, which is already provided and owned by the Government. The building alone will cost about \$7,000,000. I do not know how much money can be obtained from outside private individuals with which to erect such a building, but I am going to ask Congress at the next session to make an appropriation to provide for such building; and, as I have already stated, I know if such a building were erected to-day that the owners of three of the greatest art collections in the United States would in their wills give all of them to the Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reading of the bill will be resumed.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill beginning on page 24, line 4.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was on page 24, line 8, after the word "elsewhere," to strike out "\$67,000" and insert "\$90,000," so as to make the paragraph read:

#### PRINTING AND BINDING

For all printing and binding for the Smithsonian Institution, including all of its bureaus, offices, institutions, and services located in Washington, D. C., and elsewhere, \$90,000: *Provided*, That the expenditure of this sum shall not be restricted to a pro rata amount in any period of the fiscal year.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Tariff Commission," on page 25, line 11, after the name "District of Columbia," to insert the following proviso:

*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary of any member of the United States Tariff Commission who shall participate in any proceedings under said sections 315, 316, 317, and 318 of said act, approved September 21, 1922, wherein he or any member of his family has any special, direct, and pecuniary interest, or in which he has acted as attorney or special representative.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have two amendments which I desire to offer to that amendment, and I will explain them.

Mr. McKELLAR. To what amendment does the Senator from Utah refer?

Mr. SMOOT. I refer to the amendment on page 26, in the proviso following the appropriation for the Tariff Commission. I will explain the matter to the Senator, so that he may understand it. In the House of Representatives a provision similar to this was reported by the committee, but it went out on a point of order. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Simmons], when the bill was before the Appropriations Committee, handed me the amendment which had been stricken out on a point of order in the House and asked me if I would not endeavor to have it put on the bill in the Senate. I told him that I would. The provision was incorporated in the bill as an amendment in the exact form in which the Senator handed it to me. On examination, however, of the item it appeared there were left out of it a few words contained in the law as it exists to-day, and the amendments which I am about to offer to the amendment are to make it comply with the provisions of the existing law.

Mr. McKELLAR. In other words, the original amendment was not copied accurately?

Mr. SMOOT. The few words which I propose to insert in the amendment were left out in the provision as reported to the other House.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Ladd in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. The House committee reported an amendment in the form of a proviso to that section of the bill. I supposed that the proviso as reported by the committee and stricken out subsequently by the House upon the floor incorporated the proviso contained in the present law, and, so thinking, I handed that stricken-out proviso to the Senator from Utah and requested him to use his good offices in the committee to have it restored. Upon examination of the bill as reported by the Senate committee I discovered that some language—very important and material language—contained in the present law had been eliminated in the proviso as reported to the House and as stricken out upon the floor of the House, and I requested the Senator from Utah to amend the proviso in the bill as reported by his committee so as to conform with the provisions of the present law; and he very kindly consented to do so.

Mr. SMOOT. On line 17, page 25, after the word "in," I move to insert "respect to the subject matter of," so as to read:

wherein he or any member of his family has any special, direct, and pecuniary interest, or in respect to the subject matter of which he has acted as attorney or special representative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely satisfactory; it is absolutely correct, and should be adopted.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. On page 25, on line 18, after the word "attorney," I move to insert the words "legislative agent," so as to read:

has acted as attorney, legislative agent, or special representative.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBINSON. Now let the amendment be read as finally revised.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as amended will be stated.

The reading clerk read as follows:

*Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary of any member of the United States Tariff Commission who shall participate in any proceedings under said sections 315, 316, 317, and 318 of said act, approved September 21, 1922, wherein he or any

member of his family has any special, direct, and pecuniary interest, or in respect to the subject matter of which he has acted as attorney, legislative agent, or special representative.

Mr. ROBINSON. In that form the amendment conforms to the present law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment as amended is agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, do I understand the language as suggested by the Senator from Utah makes the agreed amendment conformable to the existing statute?

Mr. SIMMONS. It is word for word in conformity with the existing statute, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. ROBINSON. That is the provision which upon my initiative the Senate incorporated in the law after a long debate last year.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in view of this appropriation for the continuance of the Tariff Commission, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a very excellent article recently written by Mark Sullivan, which challenges attention to the purpose obviously of many individuals to cut off all importations from abroad and any exports from the United States, so that there will be no necessity for the Tariff Commission. I ask that the article may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The reading clerk read as follows:

NEW TREND IN UNITED STATES SHOWN BY FARM REPORT—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS ARE MOVING TO MAKE AMERICA SELF-CONTAINED—TARIFF TO BE LARGE FACTOR IN CHANGE—LIVING STANDARDS TO BE RAISED BY IGNORING EUROPE AS BUYER AND SELLER

(By Mark Sullivan)

(Copyright, 1925, New York Tribune (Inc.))

WASHINGTON, January 28.—The recommendations of President Coolidge's agricultural commission, made public this week, together with a request that Congress enact them into law at this session, point toward something new just ahead of us in American politics and business.

Anyone who follows closely the current developments in government and business in America must recognize the beginnings of this trend. An essential part of the trend is that government and business, including agriculture, agree upon it. This sympathetic cooperation is itself a definite condition of the era on which we are entering. The purpose of it, as yet, is partly instinctive and not fully defined even in the minds of all the leaders of it. But it is apparent that the Government and practically all lines of business in the United States are coming together in an impulse of mutual self-protection to meet the conditions of world trade arising out of the economic rehabilitation of Europe and its increasing activity.

#### A SELF-CONTAINED COUNTRY THE GOAL

The policy which America is moving toward, as yet gropingly, is one of withdrawing to itself, making itself a self-contained country, and trying to maintain our high standard of living by avoiding the competition of Europe, in either the rôle of buyer or of seller. A fairly certain result of that policy should express itself in advocacy of a tariff that will be protective beyond the previous standards of protective tariffs.

The recommendations of the agricultural commission include this: "The American farmer can neither compete with imported agricultural products nor can he compete in foreign markets for the sale of his products at world price levels" created by foreign wages and standards of living. This means that the American farmer is to get out of Europe, both as a buyer and as a seller. That policy runs counter to the former farm leadership which looked to the revival of Europe as a revival of the market for American farm products.

Running parallel to this, and implied in it, is the theory that the American farmer should at once have complete protection for his own products, and also be tolerant of complete protection for everybody else, the whole looking to a high standard of living for everybody in America. In the talk that Secretary Hoover made to this same agricultural commission last week, he said we should "maintain a tariff on agricultural products, on such a basis as will stimulate domestic production, and, I may add, this may be done at no consequential charge upon the consumer in proportion to his gains from a national policy of this character."

"The application of tariff principles should provide for agriculture the same value in stimulating domestic production as has been the case in industry. The second direction must be the development of increased domestic consumption of agricultural products per capita of population. This can only take place through development of a higher general buying power. In other words, a higher standard of living of



the whole population. In turn, this can only be brought about by the elimination of waste and increase in efficiency in our whole production and distribution system. There is room for 20 per cent or 30 per cent increase in our standards of living to-day."

#### TO RAISE NOTHING FOR EXPORT

It is inherent in the policy the agricultural commission recommended that the high standard of living in America, both for farmers and for everybody else, be kept secure by a tariff on manufactures sufficient to safeguard America against competition from abroad. This, too, runs counter to what has been the teaching of some farm leaders for years past, that the tariff on manufactures should be revised downward so as to bring about lower prices for what the farmer buys.

This new policy proposed by the agricultural commission looks to two ends. One is that the American farmer should cease to raise more of any commodity than he can sell in America. To many farmers it will come as a startling suggestion that they should cease, for example, to raise wheat for export. The cotton-raising States will be surprised at any advice to ignore the foreign market, but competent judges in Washington say the rest of the world is already tending to buy less and less of the American cotton crop and to turn for its supply to countries where it can be raised by lower-priced labor. The other end of the new policy is that America should cease to buy any agricultural products from abroad, and that we should adopt tariffs sufficient to stimulate the raising in America of everything we consume. Presumably sugar is one of the important products this part of the policy would affect.

#### TENDENCY SEEN IN RAILROAD FIELD

This tendency toward America turning in on itself to become a self-contained unit with all the trades mutually protective as against Europe is under way in other fields besides farming. Last week C. W. Barron, the owner of several financial journals, spoke of our protective tariff as one "that must be raised unless wages in other countries are raised," and reported that Belgian rails are refused in the United States at \$10 a ton below the domestic price because railroads must protect the American steel industries that give them so large a proportion of their traffic.

"But street railways and building trades may yet bid for foreign steel unless foreign wages advance or the American tariff is advanced."

It is reasonable to predict that the tariff question is ahead of us in a form it has not hitherto assumed. One wonders how long it will be before Democratic leaders of the old school take notice of this trend.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, in connection with this item in the bill I deem it proper to make a few observations with reference to the Tariff Commission, not in any partisan spirit but from an earnest desire to preserve the integrity and usefulness of that body.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator just a minute there to suggest to him that he might dwell upon the general policy which has been outlined in this article and which we see indicated by newspaper comment and which seems to come from pretty high authority, that the policy is to close up foreign markets for agricultural products and have the United States live unto itself. What sort of position will that put the cotton grower in if that policy is pursued?

Mr. SIMMONS. It will destroy him.

Mr. FLETCHER. What will become of the great industry by which the world is furnished clothing?

Mr. SIMMONS. And what will become of the wheat industry in this country?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. What will become, it might be asked, of every American agricultural industry which is producing and has been producing and must continue to produce, if it is possible for it to do so and live, products far in excess of the domestic demand? In the cotton industry it is estimated that under normal conditions only about one-half of all the cotton produced in this country is consumed here. The balance is consumed abroad. That is true, probably, of naval stores. That is true to a less degree of the wheat industry in the United States. If the farmers engaged in the production of cotton are to be limited to the domestic market, then, of course, they must reduce their production of cotton one-half; and a reduction of one-half would be fatal to the American cotton industry, and, of course, ruinous to the farmers in that section of the country where this is the chief money crop.

I did not hear the reading of the article submitted by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. My attention was diverted; but if any such policy as that indicated by the remarks of the Senator from Florida is now contemplated, and if there is propaganda tending to support that theory, I think it is very, very dangerous to the agricultural interests of this country and, incidentally and directly, to the general welfare of our people. I think it should be met with stern and determined opposition. The consequences of such a policy would be too

far-reaching and too grave to be discussed offhand. I was not aware that from any respectable sources in the United States such propaganda as that was now emanating could spring, and it amazes me to hear that any respectable authority in America, or even any individual of prominence, in industry or outside of industry, should advocate such a course.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. The article which I submitted this morning and which was read at the desk was written by Mr. Mark Sullivan, a newspaper man of standing.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me ask the Senator, is Mr. Sullivan advocating this proposed policy?

Mr. KING. No.

Mr. SIMMONS. Or is he simply chronicling some rumor with reference to it?

Mr. KING. These are his deductions, if I may use that phrase, from facts and information which have come to his attention. He predicates his article upon the report made by the special commission recently appointed by President Coolidge to study agriculture.

Mr. FLETCHER. And also upon the position taken by the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Hoover, as I understand.

Mr. KING. Yes; and the position taken by the Secretary of Commerce, and statements from manufacturers, and from Mr. Barron in his various newspapers. From all of these sources he deduces the conclusion that it is now the purpose of a large number of people to make America what they call self-contained, and that means the cutting off of our foreign commerce.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator understand from the article that it is intended that such policy shall apply solely to the products of agriculture, or that it applies to the products of industry generally?

Mr. KING. The products of industry generally; agriculture, and particularly manufactured articles.

Mr. SIMMONS. I can not conceive of a more deadly policy than that, Mr. President.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me, the writer says:

It is inherent in the policy the Agricultural Commission recommended that the high standard of living in America, both for farmers, etc., be kept secure by a tariff on manufactures sufficient to safeguard America against competition from abroad.

Then he says:

This new policy proposed by the Agricultural Commission looks to two ends. One is that the American farmer should cease to raise more of any commodity than he can sell in America. To many farmers it will come as a startling suggestion that they should cease, for example, to raise wheat for export. The cotton-raising States will be surprised at any advice to ignore the foreign market, but competent judges in Washington say the rest of the world is already tending to buy less and less of the American cotton crop, and to turn for its supply to countries where it can be raised by lower-priced labor.

Then he refers to the fact that the manufacturers are advocating this view, and that Mr. C. W. Barron, the owner of several financial journals, spoke of our protective tariff as one that must be raised and not lowered.

Mr. SIMMONS. If I understand the interpretation which the Senator from Utah places upon the suggestions contained in that article, said to emanate from respectable sources, it would mean that we are to impose upon imports such high duties as practically to exclude them.

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. And that we are to reduce our production in this country to the point of domestic demand.

Mr. KING. Mr. Sullivan's view is that a self-contained country is the goal of the present trend of certain interests and forces in the United States.

Mr. SIMMONS. The establishment of that policy, if it applies to manufactured products, would mean, in the present condition of consolidation and price fixing through trusts, that the manufacturer, having the exclusive American market, and having arranged for a monopoly in that market, could advance his price to any point that he saw fit and that afforded him any profits that his cupidity might seek. As applied to agriculture, it would mean the reduction of the output of that industry probably between one-third and one-half, and that would spell disaster to the vast portion of our population who find their livelihood by tilling the soil. It would be probably the narrowest possible policy that could be proposed to a virile and ambitious nation—a policy of cowardice, stagnation, and disaster. It would be a policy of profound and absolute isolation. Not only would it separate us from the bal-

ance of the world but it would shut off that commercial intercourse between this country and the balance of the world which in the past has been the source of our greatest prosperity, and which in the past has been the cause of the enormous expansion which has taken place in American industry and commerce, and in our amazing growth in power and usefulness.

Mr. President, I can not reconcile such a theory as a national policy with even the instincts and dictation of common sense. I must believe that there is some mistake about it, and that these suggestions upon which Mr. Sullivan bases his discussion can not mean exactly what he interprets them to mean. I read the report of this commission appointed by the President, or rather, such excerpts from the report as found their way into the public prints, and I did not get that meaning from them.

I did draw the inference, however, that the committee was under the impression that in certain lines of industry, especially some lines of agriculture, the production was rather excessive, and that possibly the public welfare might be subserved by a reduction in production along certain lines. That is true where the production is in excess of the local or domestic demand, supplemented by the foreign demand.

We have found that situation existing once or twice in cotton industry. In certain fat years when the farmers produced 16,000,000 bales of cotton and the domestic demand, plus the foreign demand, was not commensurate with that production, the farmers suffered by reason of having to take a very much reduced price because the supply exceeded the world demand.

A suggestion applicable to a condition of that sort may be wise, but when the suggestion is made without reference to the domestic and the world demand of the thing produced, to my mind it is an unreasonable suggestion, and so unreasonable that I do not think it will find serious lodgment in the minds of the intelligent class of people who control our Government and direct its policies.

I did not rise for the purpose of discussing that, however. I arose to make some general observations with reference to the Tariff Commission, and I regret very much that the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, charged with the responsibility of tariff legislation, is not in the Chamber.

For many years we debated in the Congress the question of the establishment of a tariff commission. For many years that suggestion met with opposition, serious opposition, mostly, in the first instance I think, coming from the opposite side of the Chamber, some of it coming from this side. At last, after much controversy, the proposition gained favor, but the advocates, as well as the opponents of that proposition, insisted that if a tariff commission were to be established it was essential that the commission should be a bipartisan commission. When the discussion had progressed to that point we heard great demands in this body, which I can recall very vividly, for a bipartisan commission.

What was meant by the expression "bipartisan commission"? The act which we passed by its very terms gave a very significant construction to that expression. As I recall, it provided for a commission of six members, and provided that three of those should be of one of the two major parties in this country and three of the other major party, those parties holding drastically opposing views upon the question of the tariff, not so much as an economic question but as a political question.

For many, many years, certainly ever since the Civil War, there had been a very sharp dividing line between the two parties on the question of the tariff. Therefore we provided for the appointment of an equal number upon this board representative of the two different political views which obtained in the United States upon that question.

Undoubtedly, it was in the mind of everyone who supported the proposition of a bipartisan tariff commission that the membership of that commission should be selected with reference to the views upon that question of the party to which each member belonged; that he should be appointed with reference to his reflecting the views of his party, because if he were appointed without reference to his views upon the tariff, by reason of the fact that some Democrats do not agree altogether with their party upon that question, and some Republicans do not agree altogether with their party upon that question, the division upon the lines of bipartisanship would be broken. I think that was distinctly understood by everyone. No other construction could be placed upon the facts and circumstances which surrounded the creation and the inauguration of this commission. There is no room for doubt.

I do not wish to make any specific charges, but I do think, and I do insist, that the usefulness of this commission depends upon its continuing to be bipartisan, and upon the integrity of

the appointments of members as representatives of the opposing party views upon the tariff question, and whenever we shall fall into those unhappy days when the declared legislative purpose with reference to this institution is disregarded, and when there is an effort to break down its bipartisan character, and when an effort is made to create a commission which will lean the one way or lean the other way in its membership, upon the question of the tariff, then that body will lose its usefulness, it will lose the respect and confidence of the people of this country, and it will become an engine and an instrumentality for the propagation of the views of one party upon that subject, without any reference to the views of the other party. The very essence of this organization, if it is to subserve its purpose, is the maintenance of its bipartisan attitude and character.

We have adopted what is known as the flexible tariff clause. That invests broad and sweeping powers in the President with reference to changes in the written law with regard to import duties. It authorizes him to make changes upon the findings of the Tariff Commission. We made the Tariff Commission distinctly a fact-finding commission, on that account. We did not confer upon them the power of recommendation, as I understand it. We provided that they should gather the facts and submit those facts to the President, in order to enlighten and guide his decision upon the question at issue.

It is exceedingly important that such condition should prevail. The President will not get an impartial finding of facts, but he will get a biased and partisan finding of facts, if this commission is made partisan; if, by virtue of appointments made in violation of the spirit and purpose of the act, it becomes unbalanced and its membership becomes wholly or preponderantly of one view upon the tariff. The President, in such event, instead of getting an unbiased statement of facts from this commission upon the tariff question will get merely a partisan statement of facts.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. BROUSSARD. The Senator will recall that last year when this amendment was agreed to there was quite a good deal of discussion about it. How could the Senator expect a nonpartisan finding to be gotten from the Tariff Commission if, under this provision, one of the members of the Tariff Commission could be forced to recuse himself, no provision being made to establish the equilibrium between the two parties and the two theories on the tariff question?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, that is as far as we could go at that time, but the purpose and intent was to prevent a man sitting upon that commission and giving the President the benefit of a statement of fact when it was known that his personal interest, his pecuniary concern in the matter was so great as to move him inevitably to deviate from the lines of accuracy and to make findings possibly predicated somewhat upon his interest rather than predicated upon the actual conditions in the industry. Such a man should not have been placed upon the commission, and for the very reason that a man who differs with his party upon the question of tariff should not be appointed as a representative of that party upon this commission.

Mr. BROUSSARD. If the Senator will allow me to just set myself straight, I am not objecting to the contention of the Senator that one having an interest, direct or indirect, should not sit upon a case. My objection at the time to this provision was that the act should have provided for some one else taking the place of any man so disqualified, in order to maintain the equilibrium.

Mr. KING rose.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think that would be a better solution of the question; but that solution was not open to us, because we can not appoint. The President alone can appoint and the President alone can remove. We could not reach the matter in any other way than as we did.

The motive and the purpose of this proviso is the same as the motive and the purpose I have in mind in insisting that these men who are appointed shall be selected with this in mind, that they represent on the tariff question the orthodox views of the party to which they are charged and to which they belong.

Does the Senator from Utah want to interrupt?

Mr. KING. No; I was merely intensely interested in what the Senator was saying. I did not rise to interrupt him.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am gratified by the able Senator's interest. So far from impairing the force of the argument I was making, what the Senator from Louisiana has said really strengthens it. It shows that Congress desires, as far as it can, to maintain the integrity of the commission and to secure its proper func-



tioning according to the intent of Congress, and that anything, even personal interest, that might cause a member of that body to deviate from the line of duty, namely, the finding of facts as they are, is a disqualifying fact and circumstance.

Mr. President, the best institutions of men are subverted sometimes by small encroachments upon the agencies of government, the activities of government, slight deviations in the first instance from the line of strict adherence to the purposes of the law and the objects of the institution. This organization can be destroyed, its usefulness can be undermined by a misuse of the power of appointment or by carelessness and indifference in the selection of the men who are appointed, because it is intended to be a body that shall reflect and represent the sentiments of the two great political parties upon a question that divides the 110,000,000 people of the United States. That theory lies at its very foundation. Undoubtedly there has been propaganda in the country—open, brazen, undisguised propaganda—to undermine and destroy the institution as an aid in the enforcement of the administration of our tariff laws and to bring it into disrepute by destroying the bipartisan character with which we originally clothed it; this propaganda being directed to the selection of members of the body who reflected not the sentiment of the party they were appointed to represent, but who reflected the sentiment, at least in part, of the opposition party upon the question.

I say the propaganda has been open and brazen. A few weeks ago, on January 13, I read in the Senate an editorial from the Washington Post commenting upon a certain letter alleged to have been somewhat extensively distributed among certain classes in the country advocating the appointment by the President to membership upon this commission of Democrats known to favor a protective tariff. That letter was referred to in terms of unqualified condemnation in the editorial which I read from the Washington Post. The editorial did not contain the letter referred to. I happened to have in my possession a copy of the letter that had been given to me. It was a letter issued by some branch organization of the Protective Tariff League or some organization in some way associated with the Protective Tariff League.

The letter purported upon its face to have been addressed to 100 well-selected Democrats, as I understood it, but who were "protectionist Democrats," Democrats who, while affiliating with that party, did not agree with its views upon the tariff. It was addressed to them, advocating efforts to procure the appointment by the President of the United States to fill prospective vacancies upon the Tariff Commission of Democrats who entertain the Republican theory of the tariff and who in their action upon that commission would reflect the views of the Republican Party upon that question instead of the views of the Democratic Party. The letter will be found in the Record of January 13, 1925, at page 1722.

The letter not only urged that such be done but it stated that they were inaugurating a wide publicity for the purpose of securing these appointments by the President in this way with a view of making the Tariff Commission a protective tariff commission, with a view of having a commission every member of which would entertain the views of the Republican Party upon the question of a tariff. It went further than that. It said that the propaganda if properly conducted, conducted so that they might indulge the reasonable hope of fruition and ultimate success, would require a large sum of money, and requested the recipients of the letters to mail at once to the organization checks for \$100 each to finance the movement to convert this bipartisan body into an adjunct of the protective tariff organization. For what purpose and with what view? The letter I think will explain itself upon that point.

The President now is invested with a broad power covered by a section of our present tariff law. The President now has the power to increase or to reduce, to the extent of 50 per cent, any tariff rate that the Congress may impose. If the President does that, however, he first must have a report from the Tariff Commission finding the facts to justify the reduction or to justify the increase. Therefore the argument which ran through the propaganda; therefore the argument that if a change can be secured from the original purpose and intent so that the Tariff Commission may be composed only of persons who believe in protection as interpreted and administered by the Republican Party, the President will get the facts from that body of protectionists, and of course it is expected that the coloring of those facts would reflect the Republican theory of protection.

Of course it is a very ambitious scheme, and attractive to those beneficiaries who want the tariff reformed upward. It is an ambitious scheme, and a promising one to those who want tariff duties higher than the Congress has been willing

to grant. If it can succeed it will not only bring into discredit the Tariff Commission, it will not only undermine and destroy the principle upon which the commission is based, it will not only destroy the value which we had desired to give to these finders of fact, it will not only prevent enforcement of that act as intended by the Congress, but will absolutely prevent the presentation to the President of both sides of the question, the views of those who adhere to the protective theory, the views of those who adhere to the Democratic idea of a purely competitive tariff for revenue. The President is supposed, and is able to weigh the facts presented by both sides of the controversy, presented by the plaintiff and presented by the defendant in this contention, and, like a judge sitting upon the bench, reach an impartial decision as may be. To have those facts presented to him by those who have but one view upon the subject would be subject to the imputation and the suspicion at least of having their statement of the facts distorted by their views as to the policy which should be pursued with reference to the subject matter.

Mr. President, not only that, but the country would feel, if the President lent himself to this scheme, that he was not dealing fairly with it, was not dealing squarely with it when it, trusting to his fairness, enacted legislation investing him with this broad and sweeping power with reference to the tariff, involving in many instances the life of industry, and the country's prosperity.

When we clothed the President with this great authority we imposed upon him a condition precedent to its exercise. It was a power never before delegated by a Congress to any human being, a power which was characterized here as not only exceptional, but dangerous, which probably never would have been granted to him but for the condition precedent to its exercise, that he should submit each question for finding and report to the Tariff Commission, composed of six members, three entertaining the views of one of the major parties of the country and the other three entertaining the views of the other major party of the country upon this vital question and policy, and that he should withhold action until he received from them a statement and a finding not with reference to the policy, but with reference to the facts concerning the disputed question upon which the President would be called to exercise this tremendous grant of legislative power.

Mr. President, the President could not impair the bipartisan character of the Tariff Commission without imperiling the confidence of the country in his action upon questions arising under the flexible provisions of the tariff. The President will not, in my judgment, cooperate in any such movement, whether originating with the protected industries of the United States or originating with tariff protective leagues, and thus destroy the equilibrium provided by the Congress, and in destroying that make of no effect conditions that were imposed when we gave him the power to receive reports and findings of fact from this institution, preserved and maintained in its integrity as written in the law.

I have heard reports that I would not wish, Mr. President, to repeat here; reports of deliberately planned efforts on the part of certain interests to pervert and prostitute this board for purely partisan purposes or for purposes of subserving some particular interests. They have endeavored, it is said, to induce Democratic members of the board or members of the board who are not in harmony with the views of such protected interests upon certain questions in specific instances, although they might be Republicans, to take something better, to seek higher positions, with some sort of assurances of aid in getting such higher positions, with a view to creating vacancies on the Tariff Commission which might be filled by some individual known to be in sympathy with these special interests on the question of tariff or in sympathy with the particular views of the parties interested in asking for increases in duties.

I have heard all of that. I do not credit it, Mr. President; I can not credit it. It is contrary to the integrity of the parties who enacted this legislation. It is so contrary to my conception of the dignity of the President of the United States and his high office and his fixed purpose to administer his great office in strict conformance with the law and with the principles of right and justice that I know that any such plans can not be consummated. Of course, such a plan can not be consummated, because it would require the help of the President; nor can I believe that the Republican Party will sanction any such movement, from whatever source it may originate and for whatever purpose it may be inaugurated.

I have heard, too, that efforts were to be made to prevent the reappointment of Democrats upon that board because they would not agree with their associates in the finding of facts

with reference to some industry that was opposing any reduction in tariff duties. I have heard that efforts were being made to bring about the removal of a certain member of the board with the expressed purpose of supplanting him with a protectionist, and not only with a protectionist, Mr. President, but probably a protectionist who agreed with reference to a particular item of the tariff act with certain other members of the board.

I do not, Mr. President, believe that these things will be consummated. I do not believe that they have any lodgment in the mind of the responsible leaders of the Republican Party or of the administration; but this is a propaganda that ought to be frowned upon and nipped in the bud. It is a propaganda that strikes at the very root and heart of important legislation of vital interest to the country. The propaganda can not be killed too soon. It should be denounced in unmeasured and unqualified terms from every forum that believes in and desires to see preserved the integrity of every branch of the Government.

I arose, Mr. President, to give utterance to these thoughts, and without any reflection upon the line that I would pursue, for before I took the floor I did not expect to speak five minutes. I have taken advantage of this occasion, because it probably is an opportune occasion for the purpose, of expressing these sentiments. I hope that this unholy propaganda may be nipped in the bud and that every man who believes in the integrity of this Government and who believes in carrying out the laws of the land and keeping faith may at every opportunity express his displeasure and place upon this scheme the seal of his righteous indignation.

#### APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE STATE AND OTHER DEPARTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11753) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes, requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and announcing the appointment of conferees on the part of the House.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I move the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the conference asked for by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and Mr. JONES of Washington, Mr. SMOOT, Mr. SPENCER, Mr. OVERMAN, and Mr. HARRIS were appointed conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11505) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes.

#### TARIFF DUTY ON WOOL

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I have received an interesting statement showing the financial burdens to the consumers of wool resulting from the specific duty of 31 cents per pound under the Fordney-McCumber tariff law, which I ask to have printed in the Record. It is published by the Carded Woolen Manufacturers' Association and shows some actual burdens resulting from the specific duty collected on wool since the enactment of the Fordney-McCumber tariff law. It was prepared from reports made by the Boston branch of the United States Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture. This branch of the Agriculture Department reports from time to time the amount of wool that is imported into this country, its weight by lots, and the invoice value of such wool. From these figures of the weight and the value of the wool imported, the Carded Woolen Manufacturers' Association have made certain deductions. They show what the specific duty of 31 cents per pound upon wool really represents to the public when translated into an ad valorem duty. The figures are astounding. The information proves what was urged would be the consequences at the time the high specific rate upon wool was sharply opposed during the debate in the Senate in 1923. I will read from this statement a few facts and comment upon them very briefly.

The figures as to imports of wool were collected from reports made at Boston and Philadelphia, which are the leading wool markets of our country. They show that the estimated clean weight of wool and mohair used for clothing that came into this country since the passage of the Fordney-McCumber

tariff law on September 15, 1923, to January 3, 1923, was 75,202,356 pounds. The statistics do not cover carpet wool, which is admitted free.

The average price per estimated clean pound of wool is found from these figures to be 70.8 cents.

The extreme variations of price per estimated clean pound extended from 16.2 cents to \$1.70 a pound.

The total value of the wool that has come in during this period was \$53,207,261.

The duty collected by the United States Government at 31 cents per estimated clean pound was \$23,312,730.

Please note these figures, Mr. President; the invoice value of the wool was \$53,000,000 and the duty collected, which has been added, of course, to the consumer's price, was nearly one-half of that amount, to wit, \$23,000,000.

The ad valorem equivalent of this 31-cent duty upon all these imports is 43.8 per cent. But the most interesting figures of all are those that show the extreme variations of this specific duty when translated into an ad valorem rate. These extreme variations extend from 18 per cent to 191 per cent.

Mr. President, I want to call special attention to the fact that the present specific wool duty of 31 cents per pound is compelling the poor people of America, who must buy wool of inferior quality when used in their clothing, in their sweaters, in their woolen overcoats, in their blankets, and as underwear, to pay the enormous tax of 191 per cent as a maximum. Those who can afford to buy and use the high-priced wool, the finest quality of wool, pay a tax reaching as low as 18 per cent of its invoice value. How can we justify the imposition upon our people of tax burdens that penalize poverty and discriminate so unfairly upon those of limited financial resources? That places the most extreme tax burden upon those who toil and labor on the farms and in our industries, and who must buy the cheapest clothing and the cheapest underwear because of their reduced incomes and small wages?

These figures show what a nefarious fraud it is upon the American people to levy a specific tariff duty upon wool. This specific duty is misleading, a deception on the public. If an ad valorem duty had been placed in the present tariff law, no Senator would dare to vote for a maximum tariff rate of 190 per cent upon the wool of the poor; and yet that is what these figures show is the result of the operations of this specific duty of 31 cents per pound.

How are you going to justify it? It can not be justified. Let us at least show how such specific duties as this on wool make for favoritism, discrimination, and deception plays in shaping our tariff legislation.

Why not be honest with our people? Why not tell them the whole truth? How few know, when they go to buy a suit of woolen clothes or a woolen blanket, that their Government has levied a duty for the benefit of a few woolgrowers, reaching in extreme cases to 190 per cent upon the price of the wool that is contained in their clothing, their blankets, and their underwear?

Mr. President, I protest again against this specific duty on wool because it does not disclose the exact results in increased costs to the American people, and because it is not taxing but extorting from our people, increasing prices for their woolen garments and merchandise that are indefensible. This whole record shows what an outrage and scandal it was to fix this duty at 31 cents per pound and to make it a specific rather than an ad valorem rate. The public will never know the tremendous increase in the price of the finished woolen products because of this excessive rate on raw wool.

I suppose it will do little good to protest. I suppose our people must continue to bear this burden—a burden placed upon millions of poor people for the benefit of a few. It is only one of the many iniquities and unjust tax burdens contained in the present tariff law. This wool rate, however, is the most shocking of all. I can not conceive of the American people supporting a political party that would levy such a burden upon them if they could get the actual information. It is doubtful if the public can get the facts, because these specially privileged interests that formulate and influence tariff legislation unfortunately control many of the channels of information and of publicity, so that such facts as this statement contains are not within reach of many people. If there is any one thing that is more threatening than another to the perpetuity and the security of our Government, it is the possibility that all of the sources of information in this country may in time be owned and so controlled and manipulated by these privilege seekers and beneficiaries of discriminatory tariff laws that the millions of unprotected and unorganized consumers will be unable to get the truth about the vital affairs of their own Government.



I ask, Mr. President, that this statement may be printed in the RECORD. I hope its startling information may arouse some public sentiment that will lead to the repeal of this duty of 31 cents per pound on wool.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

THE FORDNEY-M'CUMBER DUTY COLLECTED ON WOOL—A STATEMENT BY THE CARDED WOOLEN MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION, BOSTON, MASS., FEBRUARY 5, 1925

The only information accessible to the public as to the duty actually collected on wool and mohair from week to week is the report of wool imports at Boston and Philadelphia, issued by the Boston branch of the United States Bureau of Agricultural Economics, Department of Agriculture. This report gives the invoice value of each lot of wool and the clean weight as estimated by the appraisers and importers, and on which the 31-cent specific duty is assessed. From these weights and values the Carded Woolen Manufacturers' Association has calculated the value per clean pound and the ad valorem equivalent of the 31-cent rate for each lot since the reports began to appear on September 15, 1923.

As Boston and Philadelphia are the chief ports of entry for wool, these statistics cover the bulk of the wool brought into the United States and reveal accurately the actual proportions of the Fordney-McCumber duty on wool and mohair used for clothing, as distinguished from carpet wool, which is admitted free of duty. The table below gives the figures for the Boston and Philadelphia imports from September 15, 1923, to January 3, 1925.

The estimated clean weight was 75,202,356 pounds, and the invoice price per pound varied from 16.2 cents to 170.4 cents.

As the 31 cents is assessed on all kinds of wool for clothing regardless of the price, it follows that the ad valorem equivalent of the 31-cent duty varied from 18.2 per cent on the highest-priced wool (170.4 cents per pound) to 191.3 per cent on the lowest-priced wool (16.2 cents per pound).

Between these extremes every possible price per pound is to be found, the ad valorem tariff tax being lowest on the highest-priced wool and increasing as the price decreases until the highest ad valorem duty is reached on the lowest-priced wool.

The total value of the wool imported was \$53,207,261 on which a total duty of \$23,312,739 was collected, making the average ad valorem equivalent of the wool duty 43.8 per cent for the entire period.

Imports of wool at Boston and Philadelphia from September 15, 1923, to January 3, 1925

|   |               |                |
|---|---------------|----------------|
| Estimated clean weight.....                                 | pounds.....   | 75, 202, 356   |
| Average price per estimated clean pound.....                | cents.....    | 70. 8          |
| Extreme variations of prices per estimated clean pound..... | cents.....    | 16.2 to 170.4  |
| Total value of wool.....                                    |               | \$53, 207, 261 |
| Duty collected at 31 cents per estimated clean pound.....   |               | \$23, 312, 739 |
| Ad valorem equivalent of 31-cent duty.....                  | per cent..... | 43. 8          |
| Extreme variations of ad valorem.....                       | do.....       | 18.2 to 191.3  |

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I feel that I should say just a word at this time regarding the Tariff Commission.

There is not any question but that there are many rates in the present tariff law which work a very great injustice. Following up the statement just made by my colleagues upon the Finance Committee from the State of Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] with reference to the tariff on wool, I might make this further observation.

While the tariff upon the clean content is 31 cents a pound, the compensatory duty is much greater in proportion. That compensatory duty is much greater than is necessary to provide for any shrinkage of the wool in manufacture, and, of course, the manufacturer gets the full benefit of that excess. It is recognized that that compensatory duty is far beyond the mere compensating for the tariff upon raw wool; and, in addition to that, after the compensatory duty is allowed there is then permitted also on a pure-wool fabric an additional duty of 50 per cent, which means 50 per cent on the combined cost of the raw material, the labor, and every element that enters into the cost of manufacture of the commodity abroad. I do not believe that anyone who is conversant with the facts in the case believes that that 50 per cent additional duty is necessary to equalize the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad.

The flexible provisions of the tariff law provide an iron-clad rule that the President is authorized to modify the duty after first ascertaining the cost of production at home and the cost of production abroad. That is the only basis upon which the President has any authority to act. In addition to that it is provided that the Tariff Commission shall ascertain these differences in cost and report the facts to the President, and upon the facts presented the President is authorized to act.

It must be apparent that there are very few commodities as to which the difference in cost can be ascertained. I think by referring to just a few of them the point will be demonstrated. Take the very first item in the tariff law. I submit that the man does not live who can say that he has ascertained the cost of production of acetic acid, either in the United States or anywhere else. Acetic acid is one of three products of the same process. In manufacturing acetic acid alcohol and charcoal are also manufactured. No one can tell what it costs to manufacture the acetic acid as a distinct commodity. No one can tell what it costs to produce the wood alcohol as a distinct commodity, nor can anyone say what it is that the charcoal production has cost. There must be an arbitrary allocation of the costs of production.

We have a tariff upon cottonseed. We do not have a tariff upon cotton, and I should like to know who is willing to say that he knows the cost of production of cotton. Yet we have a tariff upon cottonseed.

The Senator has referred to wool. We have some very excellent sheepmen members of this body. I submit that not one of them can tell what it costs to produce wool. Nor can anyone tell what it costs to produce mutton. There must be an arbitrary allocation of costs. The costs can not be proven by mathematics or through the ascertainment of any given fact.

About a year ago, I think, the President of the United States increased the tariff upon wheat. The Tariff Commission undertook to state the difference between the cost of producing in the United States and in Canada. The man does not live who can say with any degree of certainty what it costs to produce wheat in the United States or what it costs to produce wheat in Canada.

To mention one element which the Tariff Commission used in ascertaining the difference of cost will fully illustrate the problem. In that ascertainment by the Tariff Commission the cost of producing wheat in Canada was put upon the basis of 20 bushels to the acre, and I think it was 13 bushels of wheat to the acre in the United States. Just the next year the picture was turned. There was a drought in Canada, and Canada produced only about 12 or 13 bushels of wheat to the acre, but in the United States we produced between 15 and 20.

Moreover, as to the other factors of cost, in one section of the United States last year the production of wheat was only about 10 bushels to the acre. In some sections it was not sufficient to justify the harvest. In other sections it was extraordinarily large, 20 to 30 bushels, and in some cases 40 bushels, to the acre. Who is going to say what the production per acre in the United States is under those circumstances? Undoubtedly in Canada there was the same variation. Some growers produced a certain number of bushels to the acre, others very much more per acre. Then who is going to say what the cost of production of wheat in the United States is?

Are we to take the average cost? Are we to take the highest and the lowest costs, or are we to ascertain the number of bushels produced at one price and the number of bushels at another, and then take an average? The flexible provision of the tariff law does not provide for either method. It simply says that there shall be ascertained the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad, and nobody can say what either one of those costs of production is. One may find out in different ways the average cost; he may say that 10 per cent of the article is produced at one cost and 75 per cent at another cost; but nobody can say what the cost of production is of any such commodity as I have mentioned.

The same may be said with reference to articles of manufacture. I submit that it will be found that no two manufacturers produce the same article at the same price. We may ascertain in the United States the figure at which a given concern produces, but where is to be fixed that theoretical, imaginative thing called "the cost of production" of the entire article in the United States?

That would be the result of the inquiry here, where we can get at the books of the concern, where we can find the exact cost of labor and capital, where we can determine the cost of the machinery, where we can get at the various details; but how different the picture must be when we undertake to go abroad and ascertain the cost of production there. The truth is, you can not find even the factors in the cost of production abroad. Our agents and representatives have been handicapped, have been obstructed in every attempt to ascertain the foreign costs of production. The concerns over there know that the very purpose of our trying to get at their costs is to enable us to build up a greater tariff against their commodities, and they are unwilling to open their books and to give the facts to our representatives, to let our representatives have the means of ascertaining what the facts are, because

they know that the very purpose of our getting the facts is to build up a higher tariff wall against them. But, of course, the other well-known reason is that they do not want to make public the secrets of the processes and methods of their operation.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. KING. I did not hear the first part of the Senator's statement, but what he is saying is exceedingly interesting. As I understood him, he said that the Tariff Commission takes the position that it may not require manufacturers, and others who are the beneficiaries of the tariff, even though the latter are seeking under the flexible provision of the law an increase in their rates, to open their books; that such people are denying the commission the opportunity to examine their books in order to ascertain what their costs are.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Absolutely.

Mr. KING. I am interested in that, for the reason that I was told that quite recently a corporation sought to increase the rate on an article which it was producing—and they are already very high—and there was a controversy between them and the Tariff Commission. Finally, the Tariff Commission decided they would require the production of the books in order to enable them to find out what the costs were, and the matter went into court. I have not heard what the decision was. I did hear, however, that the writ of mandate was denied upon the ground that it was discretionary with the corporation, that the commission could not compel them to produce their books. Therefore the Tariff Commission is compelled to decide upon their ipse dixit as to what the rate shall be, without being able to get the facts to justify the unsupported testimony of those seeking an increase in rates.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. If I understand the present activities of the Tariff Commission, I think we might just as well not make any appropriation for it. There is some work going on over there which I think is quite valuable, but I understand that the Tariff Commissioners themselves have been devoting all of their time to a study of subjects on which the President has called for reports under the flexible provisions of the tariff act. If that is to continue, we might as well abolish the Tariff Commission, because that provision in the present tariff law is absolutely inoperative, in my judgment, if the language of the law is carried into effect. It is impossible of application.

I hope the country will come to understand that matter. I remember soon after that provision was put into law I was attending a tariff congress in the city of Denver. The West was very much alarmed because of the flexible provisions in the tariff act. I assured them that in my humble judgment there was no cause for alarm, because if the President followed the law he could not apply it to the business interests of the country. He has acted in one or two instances, but I submit to any practical man whether he has applied the law or not. The law says that the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad shall be the only measure of activity for reduction or increase. I submit that as to wheat and the other commodities on which the President has acted no man can ascertain the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, or even the cost of production in either one of the places. There is a variation which appears to everyone.

The question of sugar is now discussed all over the country. The cost of the production of sugar has been inquired into and it is found that it has varied from a reasonable amount up to 250 per cent greater in amount. We know that sugar beets on one farm will be produced for very much less than sugar beets on another farm, even though the farms may adjoin. We know that the saccharin content of the beet varies from farm to farm. Then who will assume to say that such and such is the cost of production of sugar in the United States?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON. Has any action been taken by the Executive under the flexible provision of the tariff law with respect to the tariff on sugar?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I understand not.

Mr. ROBINSON. It is well known that the proceeding was concluded something more than six months ago in that particular. The information derived by the proceeding has never been made public. There is a resolution on the table, which has been lying there for some time, calling for that information and supplying it to the Committee on Finance,

which I assume contemplates its publication. Does the Senator now feel, in view of the importance of this controversy, that at an opportune time consideration should be given to the resolution?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I think it is highly important. I think it is highly important not only for the benefit of the Congress who will necessarily deal with the subject, but I think the country at large should understand just what the Tariff Commission is called upon to do under the flexible provision of the present tariff law.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I wish to ask the Senator from Arkansas if it is not a fact, as we are informed by statements in the press and otherwise, that a majority of the Tariff Commission have actually recommended to the President a reduction of the tariff on sugar?

Mr. ROBINSON. That has been so frequently and repeatedly stated, and received no contradiction, that I have accepted it as a fact.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. With respect to the particular commodity sugar, I have mentioned the fact of the variation in the cost of production of beet sugar in the United States—that is, sufficiently so that the mind can understand the situation as it actually is. But how much more difficult it is when we come to the foreign cost of production. A few years ago I happened to be in the Hawaiian Islands, where they were producing sugar. In some sections of the island of Oahu there is rain every day, and sugar is produced with ample rainfall and without any cost for irrigation. On the opposite side of the island there is an extreme drouth all the time, with substantially no precipitation. There they have produced sugar by pumping water. In some cases they only pump a few feet, and in other cases I am told they pump as much as 700 feet. Who is going to say what is the cost of the production of sugar there?

I do not blame the President for not acting on the sugar-tariff question. I do not know what the Tariff Commission has reported to him, but I do know that the Tariff Commission could not make any report to him which would furnish him a basis for applying the flexible provision of the tariff act. I understand that they have undertaken to say what the difference is in the cost of production. I am unwilling to concede that there is a technical expert unembodied mind which can say what the cost of production is when it varies. The most that the Tariff Commission ought to report and can report is that the cost of production varies. If they have ample means they can ascertain how much it costs to produce the first 10 per cent, how much possibly for the next 10 per cent, and so on down; but where is the expert mind or any other mind that can sit upon the witness stand and say that \$1.25 is the difference in the cost of production?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. In this connection the Senator also ought to include for what year they have stated the cost of production, or for what period of time, because in an examination of the matter there is no question of a doubt that there is as much as 50 per cent variation in the periods of time which may be selected.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I will say to the Senator that I entirely agree with him, and I used that illustration with regard to wheat earlier in my remarks. In the year 1923 Canada produced about 20 bushels of wheat to the acre. This year Canada did not produce 10 bushels of wheat to the acre on the average. So we have not only a variation in each year, but we have a variation from year to year. There is absolutely no way of making the law applicable to business affairs in the production of commodities either from the soil or from the factory. The same principle obtains.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. ROBINSON. Is it not the primary effect of the flexible provision of the tariff act to give the Executive power to determine conclusively the question of the cost of production, and having made the determination to reduce or lower the rate within the limitation of 50 per cent without substantially any form of appeal from any transaction? In other words, if the executive branch finds that a state of facts, from any evidence whatsoever submitted, justifies raising the rates or lowering it, his finding is conclusive. There is no way to go into the correctness of his finding or to determine the question of a preponderance of the evidence. When the Executive finds



that the circumstances justify the lowering of a rate, his finding is to all intents and purposes conclusive, and when he finds that the circumstances justify the raising of a rate the same is true.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Undoubtedly.

Mr. ROBINSON. So the Executive can do what he pleases in the matter and in that way make the law.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That is the assumption of the administration, but I have often wondered whether under certain circumstances that action of the President could not be reviewed by the courts of the country. In the case of the cost of the production of wheat I think the courts would take judicial notice of the fact that all wheat is not produced at any one given price for any given amount; that the President, in fixing a specific amount as the cost, must have used some discretion, and that it was not a fact which could be definitely ascertained except either by arbitrary action or by using discretion in excluding certain factors and including others which ought not to have been included. I believe that the courts ought to be called upon to review this provision of the law and give us to understand whether or not it is giving away legislative power by the Congress and conferring it upon the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I think the Senator from New Mexico will remember that the Senate voted out that provision in the bill upon a record vote, and that we got the flexible provision in conference, the House insisting upon it, but that it was the judgment of the Senate that this power of the Congress should not be delegated to any other body, and especially in view of the fact that we are vesting discretion when we delegate those powers to the President of the United States.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The Senator from Louisiana will doubtless recall that it was argued upon the floor of the Senate at the time that such a provision was contrary to the mandates of the Constitution. I believed it then and I believe it now. In a proper case I believe that the courts would have jurisdiction to review the action of the President in undertaking to enforce it, and I should like very much if somebody interested in some industry where the case is plain would institute a proceeding in court to test the validity of that provision of the act.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I always hesitate to express any opinion at variance with the views of the able Senator from New Mexico, because he is a sound legislator and a great lawyer. I venture to suggest to him, however, assuming the constitutionality of the act, that if we give to the President of the United States the discretion or the power to review the facts which may be submitted to him by the Tariff Commission and give to him the power then to fix the tariff rates, whether he thinks that would be subject to review? It strikes me that if there is a scintilla of evidence, using the lawyer's expression and giving it its legalistic interpretation, no court would have the power of review. Then when we challenge particularly the executive power of the Government and the President of the United States, I am inclined to think that no court would go contrary to the view which he had expressed and the finding which the President made, and the load which he would rivet upon the unfortunate backs of the taxpayers of the Nation by the increased rates.

I am assuming there is a scintilla of evidence. If there is absolutely no evidence, it is barely possible that the court might then say the President had erred, and yet I am afraid, assuming the constitutionality of the act, that if we commit to him the power which we have in that act, his findings may be at variance not only with the preponderance of the evidence, as stated by our able leader, but if there was no evidence to support the findings, I am afraid that no court would challenge his findings, and they would say he was entitled to use information and his own knowledge and the deductions which he drew from the testimony, though there was no specific statement of the facts which would warrant the conclusion which he had announced.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think the Senator from Utah is absolutely right in his contention that this power invested in the President is arbitrary, notwithstanding he can not exercise it until he has had the findings of fact by the commission. There is nothing in the law, however, that requires him to find any part of the facts or give any reasons for his decision.

His power to decide and determine a question is plenary and absolute. He simply must have this information before he proceeds, but he is not, like a jury, compelled to weigh and determine the weight of the evidence. It is his conclusion that prevails.

The only possible attack upon the findings of the President in one of these proceedings would be upon the ground of the unconstitutionality of the act. Of course, if the act is unconstitutional, then whatever the President may do in pursuance of it is tainted with that infirmity. That is the only way in which, I think, any citizen of this country can successfully assert any remedy for relief against the action of the President in determining the question of whether a rate shall be raised or shall be reduced.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The point which I was trying to present was just that—whether or not the act itself was in conformity with the Constitution.

Mr. KING. I think its constitutionality may be challenged, Mr. President.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. And it was that question alone that I suggested might be challenged in the courts. It is one that I should like very much to see challenged in the courts, so as to have an expression of opinion upon it from the Supreme Court of the United States. It is apparent from the language of the act itself that no one can ascertain, except in an arbitrary way, the very facts which are the foundation for activity under the act. However, I do not care to argue that question here now. It was argued quite extensively by different Senators at the time the provision was under discussion in the Senate and at the time it was enacted into law.

There is, however, a great work for a Tariff Commission to perform. As I have stated, under the present law I think the Tariff Commission has frittered away its time and the money of the people; I do not believe that it is serving any useful purpose; but there is a great work which the Tariff Commission should perform. A Tariff Commission operating along proper lines has no more urgent or earnest supporter than am I. I am willing not only to give the Tariff Commission the \$700,000 provided for in this bill but twice that much if it can be used in a proper way; but if we are going on as we are now we might as well take most of these hundreds of thousands of dollars and consign them to the Potomac River.

There is much that a tariff commission can do and which it ought to do. I discussed that fully when we had the present tariff law under consideration. I then said I thought the tariff law ought to be framed without any thought that the prosperity of the industries of the country should be taken into consideration. I would not by law seriously injure a single legitimate industry, but I do not want, through taxation, to put it in the power of any individual concern merely to levy tribute upon the masses of the people. We ought to have the facts, for if there was ever a time in our history when the Congress and the people ought to know the facts, this is the time.

As I previously stated, in my humble judgment, we are approaching a period in our financial and economic history when people must give consideration to the subject of our foreign commerce. I should like again to call attention to the fact that the remainder of the world is indebted to the United States to-day in about the sum of \$20,000,000,000. Last year we extended credits to foreign governments and their nationals in the amount of about one and a half billion dollars. It has been those credits which have bolstered up and kept going the foreign commerce of this country. We have been producing our wheat, our cotton, our copper, our farming implements, and various manufactured commodities and sending them abroad and getting in return nothing but slips of paper. How long will it be until this country will become saturated with this foreign paper? When that time shall come our foreign commerce is going to be greatly decreased.

The necessities of foreign peoples after the war were recognized; it was essential for them to import foodstuffs and other commodities from the outside world in order to live. They have managed in every conceivable way to purchase in the United States the commodities which they must have; but they are becoming rehabilitated, and the farmers abroad are now producing the things with which to feed their own peoples. They are gradually gathering in the materials for clothing; they are gradually gathering in the metals for their various manufactures and electrical supplies, and they are not getting a dollar's worth from us which they can possibly do without. The only way they are getting that which they do purchase from us is by our taking their slips of paper and they taking our wheat and other commodities.

The man on the street may say, "We are getting their gold; why not sell for money?" The truth is we have over half the



gold in all the world to-day, and if we were to rake and scrape the bottom of the treasuries of the world and secure all the gold that is used as money and bring it over here, it would not be one-fourth of the present indebtedness of other nations of the world to the United States.

I sincerely hope that the business men of this country will not only realize what I am saying, but that they will be honest enough to tell the people of the United States what it means and let them understand the responsibility of those who would fasten upon our people the present system.

International trade, in its last analysis, means and can only mean an exchange of commodities. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] referred to the high rate of 190 per cent upon some woolen goods. I have upon my desk in my office now a little pamphlet issued by the Tariff Commission about a year ago giving a sample of a hundred different kinds of cotton cloths and figuring out the rate of the tariff duty upon those finer cotton cloths. What did the figures disclose? Senators will recall the old Payne-Aldrich Act, which became a stench in the nostrils of the people of this country; and yet the Tariff Commission reported that under the last tariff law the rate of duty upon those cotton cloths averaged from 10 per cent up to over 500 per cent higher than the similar rates under the Payne-Aldrich law. I figured up the average rate and ascertained that it was 151.2 per cent higher than the average rate under the old Payne-Aldrich law.

Mr. President, the time has come when our Department of Commerce should be devoting at least half of its time to finding markets in the United States for foreign commodities, finding commodities which could be brought into this country, which our people want and which would not materially interfere with legitimate industries in the United States.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FLETCHER. Does the Senator believe that might be a means of broadening markets for our commodities and enabling us to find markets elsewhere for some of our surplus products, and would the Senator favor that? I call attention to an article by Mr. Arthur Sears Henning, appearing in the Chicago Tribune of February 8, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., February 7 (special).—President Coolidge is formulating a national agricultural policy which he believes will reverse the drooping fortunes of the husbandman and stabilize the farm industry on a permanent plan of increased profit. The fundamental principle of his policy is that agriculture shall be self-sustaining so far as the production and consumption of food and clothing are concerned. On the one hand, we shall cease to export farm products, raising no more than we consume at home; and, on the other hand, we shall raise those farm products which we import, so that we shall cease to be dependent on foreign products.

In other words, a policy of isolation and self-containment.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, just the other day the President sent to the Senate, and I suppose to the other House of Congress, some recommendations of the present agricultural commission which he has assembled here since the election. The thought contained in the letter from which the Senator from Florida has just read was embodied in that report, and it would seem that that is to be the policy of this administration. It follows quite naturally what occurred on the floor of the Senate when we were discussing the tariff bill. The then Senator from North Dakota, Mr. McCumber, who was in charge of that bill, was confronted with the problem just suggested by the Senator from Florida. He undertook to answer the inquiry as to what the wheat producers of this country were to do. Ordinarily we produce a surplus of about 20 or 25 per cent of our crop. That surplus must find a market abroad; and what did Senator McCumber advise the wheat growers of this country to do? He said: "Quit growing wheat and grow flax." That was his answer. That said to the cotton growers of this country, "Quit growing cotton and grow flax or some other commodity of which we do not produce a full supply." It said to the copper producers of this country, "Quit producing a surplus of copper," although we supply 60 per cent of the copper of the world. It said to the meat growers of this country, who export about 2,000,000,000 pounds of meat products a year, "Quit producing meat and grow flax."

I should like to inquire if the people of this country are ready to accept any such doctrine as that? Are we going to isolate ourselves from the rest of the world? That doctrine says to the great West, "Quit developing your irrigation en-

terprises; let your lands lie barren and dry." It also says to these manufacturers who have been so loud in their laudations of the last tariff act, "Quit your production; discharge your employees, so that they may grow flax rather than producing locomotives for China and South Africa."

There is one old saying which I believe has been quoted and referred to in connection with the tariff more than any other saying on the subject, I think largely because it came from a man who is so revered in this country. It was Abraham Lincoln who, in discussing the tariff, said, in speaking of steel rails: "If you want a hundred dollars' worth of rails, if you buy your rails in this country the country has the rails and the hundred dollars." That was largely applicable to conditions of the time when the statement was made; but you will recall that that statement presupposes that you have the \$100. What are you going to do with the man who has wheat and wants to buy coffee from Brazil? What the Brazilian merchant wants is dollars. The farmer has not the dollars. He has a surplus of wheat. How are you going to close that kind of a transaction if the farmer has the wheat and can not sell it for the dollars? The same thing is true with regard to any other commodity which might be obtained from abroad; or even if you wanted to buy it in this country and had no market for your wheat you would not have the \$100 here. You must first get that; and the only way in which the farmers of this country who grow wheat can get dollars for it is by finding a foreign market and getting from that foreign market something which they can exchange for the things which they actually want to use.

When we were discussing the tariff bill, the plan was suggested that the tariff should be based upon the American price. None of us knew what that meant, or how it would operate; so we appropriated \$100,000 to pay a commission to go out in the country and find the difference in prices of domestic commodities in this country and of foreign commodities sold in this country; in other words, upon a mere question of price, how the foreign commodities were competing with the domestic commodities. What did the Tariff Commission find? They brought us in here a great, voluminous report dealing with hundreds and hundreds of articles that had been examined by the experts; and what were we told? That although they were sent out for the very purpose of comparing the prices of foreign commodities with the prices of domestic commodities, over 75 per cent of the articles mentioned there were not comparable with the domestic articles at all. Although they were hunting to get the comparisons, they came to us with a report three-fourths of which was not composed of comparable articles at all, although that was their mission.

What does that mean? It means that there are thousands and thousands of articles produced abroad which, if brought into this country and entering into the life of our people, would not injure a single legitimate industry in this country. There are some articles produced abroad which can not be produced here at an economical cost. Take the finer cotton cloths: It is necessary to have the damp climate of England to produce the finer yarns. They can not be produced here at anything like a reasonable cost. Why, then, should not the people of the United States have a right to use those commodities and have a right to purchase them at a reasonable price, so that the man in England may buy the wheat from the farm, the copper from the mine, and the cotton from the field?

Instead of isolating ourselves from the rest of the world, we should put ourselves in tune with the commerce of the world, not to the destruction of any of the legitimate industries of this country, but to enable other industries which are not prospering to-day to carry on their activities, and to permit the wheat grower who has been producing wheat all his life still to grow wheat and not be forced to grow flax.

Mr. President, this subject is broad. I had no idea of discussing it at all at this time or at this session of Congress, but I could not refrain from saying just a few words while on this very important topic.

Before closing, I should like to make public mention of a very valuable small book which is entitled, "Making the Tariff in the United States." This book is edited by Dr. Thomas Walker Page, who for several years was president of the United States Tariff Commission. He was, I believe, for a number of years a professor of economics in the University of Virginia. At present he is the head of the Research Council of the Institute of Economics, which is engaged in its work here in the city of Washington.

I desire to read the statement on the front page of this book, so that it may be generally understood just what institution



it is that Doctor Page now represents and was representing when he edited this very valuable work:

The Carnegie Corporation of New York in establishing the Institute of Economics declared that "in committing to the trustees the administration of the endowment of the Institute of Economics, over which the corporation will have no control whatsoever, it has in mind a single purpose, namely, that the institute shall be conducted with the sole object of ascertaining the facts about current economic problems and of interpreting these facts for the people of the United States in the most simple and understandable form. The institute shall be administered by its trustees without regard to the special interests of any group in the body politic, whether political, social, or economic." In order that the council and staff of the institute may enjoy the freedom which is conceded as essential to scientific progress the trustees of the institute have adopted the following resolution: "The primary function of the trustees is not to express their views upon the scientific investigations conducted by the institute, but only to make it possible for such scientific work to be done under the most favorable auspices."

The officers are: Robert S. Brookings, president; Arthur T. Hadley, vice president; David F. Houston, treasurer; and Harold G. Moulton, director.

The council are: Thomas Walker Page, chairman; Harold G. Moulton, Edwin G. Nourse, and William F. Willoughby.

The trustees are: Edwin A. Alderman, Robert S. Brookings, Whiteford R. Cole, Arthur T. Hadley, David F. Houston, Charles L. Hutchinson, David Kinley, Samuel Mather, John Barton Payne, Bolton Smith, James J. Storrow, Charles D. Walcott, and Paul M. Warburg.

This rather small volume is a most readable book, and was written by one who has been in direct touch with tariff legislation for a great many years. He has no axe to grind, no particular interest to serve. He is at the head of a great, important research institution, whose purpose is to give information to the people of the country. I do not desire to do anything more than to call attention to this, but I believe that every business man in the country, every farmer in the country, every man who is producing anything, and especially every legislator, ought to become thoroughly familiar with the contents of the book. It is a most valuable presentation of the facts, and I hope that my calling attention to it may conduce in some measure to its wide reading.

Mr. KING addressed the Senate. After having spoken for some time,

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURSUM in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Illinois temporarily, because I understand he has something to say and has to leave the Chamber in a short time.

Mr. McKINLEY. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. President, the United States during the present administration has achieved unsurpassed results in economic, industrial, and administrative efforts due to the sound policies and wise statesmanship of the Republican Party.

By 1921 the Nation had demobilized more than 4,000,000 soldiers and suspended war activities that had employed approximately 7,000,000 people. It had expended as the cost of war and in the making of loans to our allies about \$33,000,000,000, a sum equivalent in value to all the gold that has been mined since the beginning of civilization. In 1921 there were 5,000,000 idle workmen. The sudden deflation of farm credits by the Democratic administration had demoralized agriculture. Unemployment brought about severe decline in domestic consumption of farm products. The domestic decline in meat consumption alone for the year 1921 was 800,000,000 pounds.

The Republican administration grappled with these problems with courage, energy, and common sense. In four years the national debt has been reduced \$3,000,000,000; the annual interest payment has been reduced \$134,000,000, and there has been a total reduction of taxes approximated at \$2,000,000,000.

#### BUDGET

This administration enacted the Budget law over Democratic opposition, and inaugurated that efficient and economical system of handling the Government finances. This was the commencement of a new era of fiscal administration. It has eliminated waste, reduced expenditures, abolished obsolete methods and substituted economy, cooperation, and coordination on the part of our executive departments in the supervision and disbursing of the public funds. This measure has greatly relieved the work of Congress.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKINLEY. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield for the present.

#### FORDNEY-M'CUMBER TARIFF

Mr. President, the Fordney-McCumber tariff has illustrated by its results that it furnishes fair protection to American labor and industry, without detriment or oppression to the consumer, and that it is the greatest revenue-producing tariff we have ever enacted.

It has brought remunerative employment to labor, prosperity to industry, better times to the farmer, and improved living conditions to our people. Under its operation our foreign trade, including imports and exports, despite Democratic predictions to the contrary, is now just about double what it averaged under the Underwood-Simmons tariff. Without the great revenues collected at our ports under the present act it would have been impossible to have reduced taxes and made such large payments on the public debt.

The United States Bureau of Labor Statistics for December, 1923, showed that the average wages in the United States were the highest ever known. This condition can only be maintained by adhering to our policy of protection, because the American laborer can not compete with the underpaid labor of other countries nor the American producer undersell his European competitor in his own market or even in our home market without being safeguarded by an adequate protective tariff.

#### FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. President, when this administration succeeded to power it found our foreign relations in a state of almost inextricable confusion and beset with grave difficulties and distracting perplexities on almost every hand. The Treaty of Versailles had left a legacy of suspicion, doubt, and resentment. We were still technically at war with the Central Powers, and the peace negotiations had provoked bitter and menacing controversies in many quarters and particularly in the Far East. These troubles, which were the cause of much serious apprehension, have generally been settled or composed, and practical diplomacy has effected the completion of 58 treaties and international agreements.

The Washington Conference on the Limitation of Armament is recognized as one of the world's outstanding movements for the promotion of peace and amity among nations. It has been said that it scrapped or suspended the projected cost in construction of more warships than had been destroyed in two thousand years. It provided that the operation of submarines should be brought within the control of international law, and condemned the use of poisonous gases as agents of civilized warfare. By the acceptance of the provisions of this conference the United States has been able to reduce its naval appropriations \$250,000,000 per annum.

During the past seven years in connection with the Inter-parliamentary Union I have made six annual visits to Europe. It is hard for the people of the 48 States, united here in one peaceful Union, to realize that west of the western boundary of Russia and continuing to the western boundary of Spain and Portugal, in an area not over three-quarters the size of the United States and compactly bound together, are 26 independent nations. Because of the many matters arising between the various nations, such as customs laws, quarantine, and so forth, it is necessary that these 26 nations should have some central agency called the league of nations, world court, or any appropriate name, whereby the differences arising may be promptly and amicably settled.

The United States, located 3,000 miles away, is hardly in the same category, but our relations with these nations are so intimate it does seem proper that there should be some instrument or some court, call it what you will, to bring us in proper contact with them. Therefore, I favor President Coolidge's suggestion of our connection with a so-called World Court.

#### IMMIGRATION

Mr. President, the regulation of immigration is purely a domestic subject and is now so recognized by all nations. On account of the enormous influx of foreign labor it became imperative, in order to maintain the prevailing wages and the greater opportunities for American workers, to adopt a restrictive immigration policy. This action was not conceived in any spirit of unfriendliness, but simply as a just and essential measure of self-protection, not only to our native but to our foreign-born people. There have come to this country as immigrants in the last 75 years more than 35,000,000 people. In the year 1907 there were admitted 1,285,349, and in 1914, 1,218,480 aliens. During the World War immigration was largely suspended because of war conditions. When the war closed it was easily foreseen that there would be a great increase of immigrants, particularly from the war-stricken countries of Europe and western Asia, and that millions of war sufferers would seek to emigrate to the United States.



The United States no longer stands in need of such an acquisition of foreign labor from abroad as that which wrought so greatly in the earlier material development of the great resources of our country. We have developed marvelous mechanical and industrial forces, which have largely overcome such requirements and are rapidly making us industrially self-sufficient. The policy of restriction is as beneficial to our foreign-born people and their children as it is to our native population, for without this policy of restriction their descendants would soon find themselves struggling with those grinding conditions of toil which are always incident to overpopulation and from which they fled in their homelands.

#### AGRICULTURE

The country at large was unable to understand the severe hardships entailed upon our farmers by the violent reaction that followed the war. The farmers were the first to feel the disastrous effects of declining prices. With the inauguration of the Democratic program of deflation in the spring of 1920 nearly all farm products were produced at a loss, while nearly everything that the farmer was buying remained at war-level prices, and the cost of transportation remained the same. The conditions became so serious as to threaten a virtual collapse of agriculture. The farmers possess one-half of the purchasing power of the Nation and consume 40 per cent of all its manufactured products. They patriotically responded to the nationwide appeal to produce more "stuff."

In order to do so they increased their expenditure of capital and intensified their efforts, and then were compelled to sell the enormously enhanced production at less than actual cost. The administration made available, as loans to the farmers of the United States, during the last four years a total of \$2,000,000,000, of which they have availed themselves by securing loans amounting to \$1,350,000,000. The Republican Party in its platform of 1924 pledged itself to the development and enactment of measures designed to place the agricultural interests of America on a basis of economic equality with other industries to insure its prosperity and success. President Coolidge, immediately after his election, proceeded to formulate plans for the relief and benefit of agriculture. He appointed a committee of men specially qualified for this important work. This committee has reported a comprehensive and feasible legislative program for the purpose of carrying out the party's pledge to the American farmers, to demonstrate that this platform pledge was made in good faith, and is urging its enactment as a law.

#### WOMEN'S BUREAU

The administration has put social service and humanitarian methods into its administrative program in a helpful and generous manner. The Women's Bureau has been an especial object of its solicitude. The purpose of this bureau is to promote the welfare and conserve the health and lives of women wage earners by providing for seats, rest rooms, wholesome quarters, proper ventilation, and sanitation, and make arrangements for their protection against fire and dangerous machinery. It provides for cooperative efforts between State and Federal officials, and the holding of conferences for the discussion of subjects, and the carrying on of research and educational work relating to wage-earning women. We have 8,500,000 women engaged in various gainful pursuits. Illinois alone has 48,497 women employed in its commercial and industrial establishments. The work of this bureau is not only of a humanitarian character, but contributes to improved service and to the better physical and moral conditions of our womanhood.

#### CHILDREN'S BUREAU

The Children's Bureau was created under President Taft's administration. The investigations of this bureau showed that approximately 250,000 babies of 1 year of age and under were dying annually and that 20,000 women died in childbirth each year. We were shocked and surprised to learn that the United States, despite its great progress in medical science, had the highest maternity death rate of all civilized countries. When President Harding was informed of this distressing fact, he promptly recommended to Congress the enactment of a law known as the infancy and maternity act. This act is one of the most important and beneficial welfare measures of recent years. To carry out its provisions \$1,240,000 was appropriated. Forty States have accepted the terms of this act. The Sixty-seventh and Sixty-eighth Congresses appropriated a total of \$5,240,000 for the humanitarian work of the Women's and Children's Bureaus.

Such in brief is a summary of the principal achievements of the Harding-Coolidge administration. They are the logical fruits of carrying out the time-honored principles and funda-

mental policies of the Republican Party. These results were passed upon by the American voter in the recent presidential election and overwhelmingly approved. Never have our people so generally expressed profound confidence in the wisdom and statesmanship or a deeper sense of the appreciation of the fidelity and public services of a living President than was illustrated by the tremendous popular vote cast for President Coolidge. The election of the President, together with the election of a Republican Congress, has not only relieved the country from disquieting fears but is accepted as an assurance that the Nation will be blessed with stability, peace, and prosperity at home, and that its rights will be upheld abroad, and its honor respected among all nations.

Mr. KING resumed his speech, which is entire as follows:

Mr. President, this morning I inserted in the RECORD an article by Mr. Mark Sullivan, appearing in the New York Tribune and other newspapers, under date of January 28. The views contained in this article have been provocative of an interesting discussion.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] in his able address has exposed the fallacy of the "isolation" policy which seems to be the program of this administration. He has also in a conclusive manner demonstrated how injurious it would be to our country if the Tariff Commission were to be a mere partisan body, to register the will of the administration and execute the policies of the trusts and high protectionists of the land.

The able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] has just finished an admirable and instructive address and has condemned the flexible provisions of the tariff law, and exposed the evils lurking behind its provisions. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has submitted a timely statement bearing upon the tariff question.

Mr. President, Mr. Sullivan's article challenges attention to a condition which ought to arouse not only the attention of Congress, but all students of economic and political problems throughout the country. This writer perceives a movement which has for its object the fastening upon our country of a policy which is—I was about to say, prehistoric—but certainly archaic, highly reactionary, and destructive of our economic and political development. This policy contemplates the erection of a wall around the United States which will cut off imports and prevent exports, and isolate our country from contact with the rest of the world.

One is amazed to think that in this age of enlightenment there should be so many proponents of a policy so deadly, so destructive, and so hostile to the great currents of progress, freedom, prosperity, civilization, and world fellowship that are carrying humanity forward. That there should be a movement of such strength and vigor in the United States is astounding and must fill with apprehension, if not dismay, those who have believed that moral and spiritual forces are to govern in this world and that this Nation was to be a prime factor in advancing world peace and fellowship and a reign of justice and righteousness among all peoples.

The program foreshadowed by Mr. Sullivan contemplates the economic isolation of the United States. In plain terms, it means that we are to pursue the policy which China pursued for 4,000 years. We are to import nothing from other nations; we are to export nothing to other peoples; we are to be a "self-contained" country, producing all that we consume and consuming all that we produce. It appears that this movement is assuming such formidable proportions that manufacturers and representatives of agriculture have agreed upon a policy of legislation which will accomplish this result.

The program contemplates that the farmers will raise no more of any commodity than can be marketed in the United States. Our fertile fields and productive farms, capable of supplying the needs of two or three hundred millions of people, are, in part, to lie idle. The great cotton fields of the South, which supply the major part of the needs of the world's teeming millions, are to produce but a small fraction of their capacity, and the greater portion of them are to be returned to their former wild and uncultivated condition.

Our merchant marine is to be destroyed and our ships are to rot in our ports and harbors; American commerce is to be driven from the seas and our flag seen in foreign ports only upon battleships. The output of our factories and mills and plants is to be restricted; their markets are to be provincial and local; our great captains of industry are to conquer only America; they are to seek no conquests beyond the boundaries of the United States. They are to be left alone to form combinations and trusts and advance prices to levels heretofore unheard of, and to exploit their own employees and the domestic consumers of their products.



Mr. Sullivan states:

That the Government and practically all lines of business in the United States are coming together in an impulse of mutual self-protection to meet the conditions of world trade arising out of the economic rehabilitation of Europe and its increasing activity.

The policy which America is moving toward, as yet gropingly, is one of withdrawing to itself, making itself a self-contained country, and trying to maintain our high standard of living by avoiding the competition of Europe, in either the rôle of buyer and seller. A fairly certain result of that policy should express itself in advocacy of a tariff that will be protective beyond previous standards of protective tariff.

There can be no difference of opinion as to the meaning of this policy. The Government it seems is backing it, and the big business interests of the United States are supporting it. When the Government is referred to by the writer, he means, of course, Mr. Coolidge and the Republican administration. No one is foolish enough to believe that this administration is not reactionary; that it is not controlled by the trusts and the plutocratic and predatory interests of the United States. These sinister forces controlled the Cleveland convention; they wrote the Republican platform; they nominated Mr. Coolidge and Mr. Dawes; and now they are to be rewarded. The Government, that is the Executive and the administration, are to cooperate with the reactionary elements which are to put into effect a program that will isolate the United States from the rest of the world.

And Senators will note the hypocritical character of the defense made for this movement. It is to make the United States a "self-contained" country and to maintain "our high standard of living." The people are to be caught by the same sophistry and the same false and deceptive arguments that have been employed by reactionary Republicans in urging and defending their protective-tariff views. Now they go not a step but hundreds of leagues farther. Made arrogant and domineering by their past victories, they would now rivet upon this country their selfish and destructive and, indeed, wicked policies, which would not only paralyze and petrify our economic and industrial life but destroy the foundations of freedom and progress which heretofore have given vitality and inspiration to the people of this land.

China was a "self-contained" nation, but it was stagnant and unresponsive to the great moral, spiritual, and economic forces that were changing the face of the earth. The policy of the Bolshevik régime is akin to that which is being advocated by the administration and the selfish and reactionary forces in our country. In Russia freedom of trade is prohibited. There can be neither exports nor imports except through organizations approved by the Government, and every means possible is employed to prevent importations of commodities which can possibly be produced in Russia, no matter how difficult or costly. The Bolshevik plan is to have a "self-contained" nation and permit no integration of their economic life with that of the people of the world, and to build dikes and dams around their colossal country and prevent any cultural or political or moral streams from reaching the dry and arid lands which now bring only poverty, sorrow, and death to the Russian people.

Mr. President, it would seem that the leaders of the Republican Party and those who are supporting this frightfully destructive policy must have forgotten all the lessons of history, all principles of political economy, all teachings of inspired religion, and all concepts of an overruling Providence working through the centuries to eliminate selfishness and greed and prejudice and ignorance in the world, to the end that humanity might be united in the bonds of fellowship and love.

This policy is the apotheosis of selfishness and greed. It is the negation of all the positive and civilizing and spiritualizing forces which prophets and men of vision in all ages have known were operating throughout the world. It is an atavistic policy, a reversion to old types, a recrudescence of the spirit of the troglodytes and the barbarous and uncivilized peoples of the past who sought isolation and regarded all other tribes, races, and peoples as their enemies, to be preyed upon and, if possible, exterminated.

It is a sad commentary upon the statesmanship of the Republican Party that with the world in ferment, seeking leaders and policies, and the people seeking leaders to direct them in the paths of safety and peace and policies that will rehabilitate the world industrially, it can produce neither leaders competent to guide the world nor measures which will accomplish these desired results. We are offered a tried and discarded formula, national isolation, and the world is informed that we are to be no part of them.

Mr. President, for many years the Republican Party has been dominated by the protected interests, by those who have used the Government to enable them to exploit the people. Constitutional limitations have been disregarded, and measures have been driven through Congress and received the approval of Republican executives which have increased the burdens of the many and materially contributed to the enrichment of the few. Tariff laws were enacted which contravened sound economic principles and interrupted the natural laws of trade so essential to a wholesome economic condition. Under the guise of taxation the masses of the people have been robbed only to increase the swollen fortunes of predatory elements in our country. The farmers and the great army of employees in factories and mines, and in the various industries and activities of our country, were made to believe that class legislation, high protective measures, bounties, and bonuses were for their benefit. For many years an extensive and, indeed, intensive propaganda has been carried on by protected interests, by trusts, and by great aggregations of wealth to persuade the agricultural classes to support the Republican Party.

When the farmers directed attention to the fact that their products were greatly in excess of the demands of the domestic market, and that they must find foreign markets for their surplus, and that the foreign markets fixed the prices of their commodities, and further that the prices of the articles and commodities which they were compelled to buy were fixed by combinations and trusts and by the beneficiaries of high protective laws which enabled the manufacturers to increase the prices of their commodities they were told by these same manufacturers and beneficiaries of unjust measures that our whole economic system would collapse and disaster would overtake the agriculturists of our country if the tariff wall was in any manner assaulted.

And the pity of it is that millions of our farmers and employees believed these sophistical, unsound, and untruthful statements and were influenced by this insidious propaganda, to the carrying on of which these selfish interests annually contributed enormous sums.

A number of years ago the farmers began to learn that these protected barons were exploiting them, and that they were annually shipping to foreign countries manufactured articles of the value of tens of millions of dollars and selling them at prices far below those obtaining in domestic markets. In other words, the farmers and the great body of consumers in the United States were being robbed for the benefit of the protected interests of the United States.

The crimes committed under the guise of protection can never be catalogued. The amounts wrung from the people by tariff laws and transferred to the pockets of tariff beneficiaries can never be definitely ascertained, but it is certain that they run into astronomical figures, aggregating many billions of dollars.

People sometimes marvel at the enormous wealth controlled by a limited number of individuals in the United States, and they are amazed to learn how few corporations and individuals dominate and control the industrial life of our country. The happiness and felicity of a people are determined not by the aggregate amount of wealth which they possess but, rather, by its manner of distribution. Of course, I do not mean to infer that wealth is the true source of happiness and felicity. There are other factors far more important.

But no social system can long survive, in which the centralizing forces are paramount. Much has been written about social solidarity, industrial equality, and democracy in the industrial life of the people; doubtless many crude and fantastic views have been expressed by those who have written upon these matters; but, nevertheless, there is an ideal state, not projected alone by great humanitarians, religious reformers, and prophets, but by wise statesmen and men who have studied history and the rise and fall of nations and who know the practical questions involved in human progress. When education comes and people enjoy equal political and civil rights, there will be an irresistible demand for an industrial system that is founded upon justice and equity.

Wealth is not money; wealth is the product of labor. And with the march of civilization an industrial system which, as if by gravitation, concentrates in the hands of a few the product of labor will fail. Justice is not an evanescent and an unrealized thing. It must be a real, live, and vital thing; it must operate not alone in the political life of the people but in their economic and industrial life, and find place in all social relations.

The people are awakening, not in our country alone but everywhere. Their cries of revolt can be heard against old customs and the relics of feudalism and Procrustean policies

which have so cruelly operated in the past. This is the age of democracy; it is the day when the people will rule; the hour has come when privilege, selfish, intriguing, and corrupt and cruel privilege must be scourged from its high place and the people crowned. But now, as always, reactionary and sinister forces oppose the right and seek to beguile the people and seduce them from the path of duty and the way which leads to their own emancipation. But now, as in the past, deaf ears are often turned to those who seek for justice and political freedom.

Such was the case in the last election, and we now have enthroned in power the sordid and reactionary forces whose purpose it is to strengthen their hold upon the economic life of the Nation. Many of the farmers of the United States of late have perceived the manner in which they have been betrayed by the tariff barons of our country, and they have demanded that the tariff rates be lowered so that they will not be compelled to pay inordinate prices to the trusts and protected interests. Knowing that they had sown to the wind and might reap the whirlwind, cunning and crafty protectionists have attempted to abate the rising storm and now suggest that the tariff wall be so constructed as to prohibit the importation of all agricultural products, and thus give to the American farmer a monopoly of the home market. Doubtless this scheme will receive much support. The full significance of it will not be appreciated by all, and its menace to the peace and prosperity of our country will not be realized by millions of the American people. That it is a menace no thoughtful man can deny; that it will work irreparable injury to our country, every honest student must confess.

Mr. President, the prosperity of the American people depends largely upon the expansion of their foreign trade. If they are restricted to domestic markets, then the primacy of our Nation in industrial and in material and moral leadership will be lost. With our limitless resources we can at the present time, after satisfying our own needs, annually produce for export agricultural products sufficient to supply the needs of between one and two hundred millions of people. With our unparalleled variety of raw materials, our great factories and mills and industrial plants, and available wealth for the construction of additional plants, together with the genius and energy of the American people, we can annually provide for export manufactured products of the value of from ten to twenty-five billions of dollars.

Indeed, Mr. President, our resources are so great and our power of production so limitless that it is not extravagance to say that America could feed and clothe more than two hundred millions of people.

And the world is ready for our products. Peoples from every land are stretching forth their hands to receive the output of our mills and mines and fields and farms. The peoples of the world not only desire our material products but they sincerely desire the most friendly relations and binding friendship which will unite the nations for the promotion of universal peace and happiness.

And with this inviting field it is now proposed by selfish and arrogant forces in our country to repulse the friendly advances of the world and build high a wall of separation with no means of entrance or mode of exit. This is a blind, stupid, and wicked policy to which it appears the Republican administration has given its assent. Indeed, we are advised that the President has approved one chapter in this sordid policy which forbids imports and will prohibit exports.

This policy accepts the fallacy that high wages are conclusive evidence of prosperity and that a high standard of living is made possible when a high wage scale exists. One would think the fallacy of this proposition would be apparent even to the dullest when the statement is made everywhere throughout the land that the dollar received by the wage earner is but a 50-cent dollar; that it has lost its value, and because of this loss its purchasing power has been reduced. It is understood by all that even the gold dollar fluctuates in value—that is, in its purchasing power—and that wages are determined in the last analysis not by what one receives but by the commodities which the dollar will purchase.

In the early days of the war the laboring men were impressed with the fact that the dollar was a very uncertain measure of value; that the wage received at the end of the week, though perhaps greatly in excess of the wage paid the preceding week, would purchase far less than the smaller sum heretofore received, and that as the prices of commodities mounted, the demand for increases in wages grew more emphatic, and as wages were increased the prices of commodities advanced. But notwithstanding the enormous advance in wages the prices of commodities far outstripped wage increases.

We frequently hear wage earners state that 15 or 20 years ago they could purchase more with \$1 than they can now with three or four dollars.

When in Germany and Russia, a short time ago, I discovered that high wages, measured by rubles and marks, meant but little. In Russia a man working in the factory would receive several billion rubles for his day's labor, but it required a month's service to get enough rubles to buy a pair of shoes. And in Germany the mark was of so little value that it was scarcely worth the paper upon which it was printed. It is more important to have a stable ratio between the dollar and commodities which the people are compelled to purchase than to have high normal wages which have an uncertain and fluctuating purchasing value.

In my opinion it would have been better for the American people if the prices of commodities had not reached such high levels, calling for corresponding increases in wages. I should add, however, that the advance in wages scarcely ever keeps pace with the increase in prices. We know that in Germany the fall of the mark inured to the advantage of the capitalist and the manufacturer, but never to the advantage of the employee. The employee was paid in a constantly depreciating mark, and wage advances lagged far behind the increase in prices, measured by marks, of the commodities and products which the employee was compelled to purchase.

Mr. President, I have heretofore called the attention of the Senate to the fact that many European economists and business men appreciate the advantage which the European countries and other countries of the world will enjoy over the United States in securing important and perhaps controlling places in the markets of the world by reason of what they call the fictitious standards which now exist in the United States. Even if this foolish scheme referred to by Mr. Sullivan in the article mentioned heretofore were not projected, America could not hope to win and hold that commanding place in world trade which its resources and situation entitle it to, if it continues a policy of inflation which particularly reacts upon prices of manufactured commodities and raw materials so imperatively needed by other countries.

It seems to me that the manufacturers of the United States and many of our political leaders are suffering from stupidity or blindness, or both. We have appropriated tens of millions of dollars this session, ostensibly to aid in the development of our foreign trade. Our appropriation bills have carried tens of millions of dollars for the maintenance of our merchant marine. We will this session appropriate, or authorize the appropriation of, more than \$100,000,000 for our rivers and harbors, in order that our foreign trade and commerce may develop, and yet Republican leaders and the great financial and industrial forces of our country propose the execution of a plan which will inevitably drive us from the seas and the markets of the world.

Their policy, Mr. President, is more absurd than that which prevailed under the mercantile system, which was so omnipotent during the seventeenth and the early part of the eighteenth centuries. That system sought to restrict the importation of all foreign goods by means of tariff walls. It did, however, encourage exports, hoping to attract as much gold and silver as possible, to be held as a reserve of money. This system was founded largely upon the fallacy that money is equivalent to wealth. The cult of incompetence which devised that system is working overtime in projecting one now which is more fallacious and indeed more deadly.

A cynic has stated "that democracy is a form of government in which a few individuals exploit the resources of society for their own benefit." He must have foreseen this policy of the Republican leaders and the vested interests of our country.

Herbert Spencer has said:

It is strange how impervious to evidence the mind becomes when once prepossessed.

Mr. President, what is needed is a return to sound economic principles, recognition of the fact that a fictitious and inflated industrial condition is not only unwholesome but dangerous. We must realize that we are a part of the arc of a great circle, and must take our place in the world circle. We must at the earliest practicable moment adjust our economic and industrial situation to meet the tides and currents of world trade and commerce. We are, by legislative bellows, forcing fetid air into our industrial system. We should be careful lest the pressure produce an explosion. Balloons often burst with fatal consequences.

All right-minded and patriotic Americans desire the prosperity of all employees; indeed, of all people; but, as I have indicated, prosperity is not determined by the wages paid.



Mr. Atkinson, in his work on Facts and Figures, the Basis of Economic Science, has said:

The theory that high prices make high wages is so shallow as to make one wonder that any man of common sense should present it. When it is remembered that 90 per cent of the demand for food, fuel, clothing, and shelter is for the supply of small farmers, farm laborers, common laborers, wage earners, factory operatives, mechanics, and persons of small fixed incomes it becomes plain that high prices quickly diminish consumption by leading to forced economy. This tends at once to lessen the demand for labor, to the discharge of large numbers of workmen, and to efforts to reduce rates of wages; then follow strikes and other misdirected efforts to get relief. One may sympathize with the workmen under these conditions without approving their misdirected methods.

Mr. President, it does seem as though the Republican leaders and the selfish interests are determined to interpose every possible obstacle to genuine prosperity and to a solid and substantial growth in the economic and industrial life of our country. They want to impose the remnants of feudal institutions and worn-out customs and discarded financial and economic policies which have persisted in one form or another from the days when people lived in groups and tribes. I submit that any national policy which produces separation or isolation or which tends in that direction is unnatural, unwise, and opposed to the best interests of the country practicing it, as well as to the rest of the world.

The progress of the world is measured by the tendency toward gregariousness. Religion, science, and the great inventions and discoveries have brought propinquity, and distant lands are now brought nearer together, and this globe of ours has shrunk to small dimensions. We now speak with our friends on the other side of the globe, and we shall soon be able to see our loved ones in distant lands.

The patriot and the statesman to-day is pleading not for isolation, but for world unity, for a recognized code of international law, for a world court, and for world fellowship. He perceives that isolation is a step backward and that a policy of economic isolation would result in cultural, educational, and spiritual isolation. Nations may be provincial as communities have been and are. There are narrow and bigoted local communities as there are illiberal and arrogant and highly conceited nations.

Mr. President, we need leaders of broad vision, men who can see beyond the 12-mile limit and comprehend the fact that there are ties that bind our Nation to other nations and bring all peoples within the influence and power of indestructible moral forces.

Mr. COPELAND. We did not extend our vision when we extended the 3-mile limit.

Mr. KING. Perhaps that is true. I think the result of the last election established that a majority of the voters were either reactionary or were misled by false issues and reiterated misrepresentations, many of which obscured the issues and some of which intimidated the people. I believe that a majority of the American people are in harmony with the ideals of the founders of this Republic and are in sympathy with all movements calculated to bring about world disarmament and world unity.

An overwhelming majority of the American people are Christians. They believe the day will come when there will be, as the great Apostle has said, "one God, one faith, and one baptism." They expend millions annually to propagate their religious faiths in foreign lands, and their contributions for the starving and the suffering in Russia, in the Near East, and in other countries where great calamities and disasters have afflicted the people aggregate annually tens of millions of dollars.

I believe they will not follow, at least for any length of time, the Tory and reactionary policies advocated by the Republican Party and which in the end, if persisted in, must be destructive of the ideals of the American people and place this Nation in a position incompatible with international progress and leadership.

My friend from New York undoubtedly realized that the Republican Party has pursued a bigoted, intolerant, and provincial attitude in dealing with foreign matters. It opposed the League of Nations or any broad and comprehensive international policy which would bring about world union. While some of its leaders have indicated a desire that the United States should adhere to the World Court insuperable obstacles have been interposed by it to prevent action by Congress which would bring about that desirable result. The leaders of public thought in our country, as well as ministers and high ecclesiasts, have earnestly advocated an international policy

which would bring us into accord with the rest of the world. They have supported the World Court. Daily hundreds, if not thousands, of letters and telegrams are received by Senators, urging that the Senate pass the necessary resolution which will enable our country to adhere to the protocol establishing the World Court. But the Republican Senate is deaf to these appeals, and many Republican leaders, as well as the selfish financial interests which are so powerful in this Republic, occupy their time in devising plans to further separate us from other nations, not only physically but morally, culturally, and educationally.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. COPELAND. I think the Senator said earlier in his remarks that our production is greatly in excess of our consumption.

Mr. KING. That is a fact. During each of the years 1918, 1919, and 1920 our foreign trade and commerce amounted to approximately \$13,000,000,000. We are producing from 10 to 25 per cent in excess of our consumption. Our resources are such that we could produce sufficient agricultural products to feed 200,000,000 people, and I have no doubt that we could so expand our other commodities and products, including raw materials, as to double and perhaps treble the present output.

Mr. COPELAND. How do our friends who are in charge of the Government expect to have any continued prosperity in America until there can be found some way to open the streams of trade and commerce in order that we may dispose of this surplus of our production? Certainly we can not dispose of that surplus until the nations on the other side are permitted to sell some of their products in order that they may have funds with which to purchase.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, the question of the Senator is timely and pertinent; it really answers itself. It is an argument in favor of commercial intercourse with other nations. But, as I have attempted to show, there are powerful forces now controlling the Republican Party which close their eyes to all historic evidence and precedents and fatuously support the view that national prosperity is coincident with national isolation. Their view is that we are a separate people; that we are powerful materially; that the world is unnecessary to our growth and development; indeed, that we will be hindered by any contact with other people. They seem to be intoxicated with the materialistic philosophy which they seek to propagate.

Not very long ago, if I may be pardoned by the Senator for seeming levity, when he sought the love of the lady who honored him with her hand he felt that if they could live upon some far-off island it would be a land of enchantment and their cup of felicity would be full. As he grew in years and came into contact with life he found that, notwithstanding the happiness and joy resulting from the union, there was a broader field in life than would be furnished by any enchanted island; that joy and happiness came from activity in that broader field which brought responsibilities and problems, indeed sorrows and perhaps tears. And he learned, as all good and wise men learn, that true happiness is the result of sacrifice and service and suffering. Joy comes from the knowledge that one is aiding others to bear the burdens of life and is contributing a full share to the discharge of the responsibilities that come to the brave and the courageous and to the weak and to the strong.

The Senator will recall that Prince Siddhartha, the founder of Buddhism, did not experience a full measure of happiness in his palaces, where it was supposed no evil or sorrow would appear. Nor did he find happiness in seclusion with the hermits and the isolationists. Happiness came from enlightenment, from knowledge, from the discovery that ignorance is the source of human misery. And Doctor Johnson, in his famous *Rasselas*, teaches the lesson that the duty of an individual as well as of a people and of a nation is to go out into the world and share its sorrows and bind up its wounds and aid in the solution of its problems.

The leaders of the Republican Party, or at least those who determine its policies and control its actions, affect to believe that our cup of happiness and felicity will be filled to overflowing if we can leave the world behind us. Apparently they would like to build a wall from the Gulf of Mexico to the Pacific, and another along the Canadian border; and then with fortifications and battleships and naval craft keep every ship and sail and every human soul far beyond the range of our powerful guns. We will then be "self-contained," and uncontaminated by the rest of the world. To be logical they should toss into the sea our law books which reveal the glories of the Justinian Code, and the Common Law, and the inspiring litera-

ture from Homer to the last great teacher and prophet who has inspired the hearts of the world.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, in medicine we consider when an organ which has been fully developed and useful becomes withered and useless that it has atrophied; that is a diseased condition. Does the Senator from Utah think that we could, as a Nation, have health if there is to be such atrophy of our national resources and capacities as he has suggested?

Mr. KING. Of course not, Mr. President. Our vigor and growth will be measured by our associations with other nations. The condition of aloofness which is being sought by the selfish leaders and forces referred to by Mr. Sullivan would soon lead to stagnation and atrophy. Our industries would become stagnant, and the genius and ambition and force and power of the people would suffer from a progressive paralysis. Trusts and combinations to restrain competition would soon control industry. Doubtless class distinctions would arise, and the masses of the people would be condemned to a social inferiority. It is safe to say that there would be retrogression or violent revolutions culminating in the overthrow of the Government and the establishment of a new industrial order and a new political system.

Mr. President, I believe that this incomparable land has been specially favored by Divine Providence; that it is the duty and the destiny of this Republic to lead the world, not by force but by example, by helpfulness and sympathy, which will cheerfully lead to an assumption of many of the burdens and sorrows of those who dwell in the shadows.

The spirit of the isolationist is that of weakness and conceit and superciliousness. There are too many Americans of that character. They think that we can learn nothing from other people; they are satisfied with "Main Street"; everything must be made at home and branded and labeled "America." Shakespeare is provincial and out of date; Goethe is obsolete; India, the home of moral philosophy and poetry, is barbarous. They would measure everything by a utilitarian if not a materialistic standard.

Mr. President, much is said in a flamboyant style about being "100 per cent American." I am somewhat suspicious of those who are always proclaiming their Americanism and their patriotic devotion to the Republic. Frenzied appeals of this character sometimes conceal ignoble purposes. I believe that a man can be an American in all that the term implies, and love his country with a devotion that ends only in death, and yet feel that he is a part of the world and owes a duty to the people of the world. I believe that a man can be a better American and will be willing to make greater sacrifices for his country if he believes that all people are the children of one common father; that justice and freedom are to be the inheritance of all; that righteousness will eventually cover the earth as the waters cover the mighty deep; and that this Nation under God is to carry high the standard of truth; is to be not only the leader but the servant, guiding and helping in the establishment of peace and the promotion of justice in all the world.

[At this point Mr. KING was interrupted by Mr. McKINLEY.]

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I think there could be no greater evidence of a man's friendship for another than for a Democrat to yield the floor to a Republican to deliver a speech and to compel the former to sit by his side and listen to his cross-word puzzle speech in defense of the Republican Party—

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. And have it printed in the middle of his own speech.

Mr. KING. I hope the printer will put the first part of my speech and the part I am now about to deliver together, either before or after the speech of the Senator from Illinois.

Sensors will recall that I was addressing the Senate and had nearly concluded my observations when the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McKINLEY], because of the fact that he was compelled to soon leave the Chamber, asked me to yield to him in order that he might deliver a prepared speech. I gladly yielded, and will now conclude what I have to say.

The Senator from Illinois has furnished me a text for a long speech, but I shall not avail myself of the text or consume much time of the Senate. The Senator must be a great optimist if he can find, as he declares, great comfort from the achievements of the Republican Party. His optimism reminds me of the definition of an optimist. It is "one who writes his cross-word puzzles in ink." [Laughter.]

In the remarks which I submitted before the interruption by the Senator I had referred to the provincial and Tory view of the Republicans and to the forces controlling the Republican Party, and to the movement now being inaugurated to enact a prohibitive tariff and make this Nation "self-contained."

The Senator from Illinois has referred to his connection with the Interparliamentary Union and to the many matters—

arising between the various nations, making it necessary that 20 nations should have some central agency called the League of Nations, World Court, or any proper name whereby the differences arising may be promptly and amicably settled.

He also states that our relations with these nations are so intimate that it seems proper that there should be some court that will bring us into proper contact with them.

Evidently the Senator has not yet felt the full sweep of this evil movement which is to isolate the United States from the rest of the world. He still worships at the shrine of protectionism, with all of the selfishness and sordidness that have inspired and still inspire the tariff policies of the Republican Party, and eulogizes in the speech which he has just delivered the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill, which is the worst tariff law ever enacted; but in the same breath he declares for the World Court and intimates that we should have "intimate relations" with European nations.

I beg to remind the Senator that the World Court was provided for by the League of Nations, which the Senator condemns, or at least he opposes the entrance of the United States into the League of Nations. The Senator is willing, apparently, for the League of Nations to function in Europe, but not elsewhere; and he approves of the United States, and doubtless all other nations, adhering to the World Court, though that great tribunal was organized pursuant to the provisions of the Versailles treaty and under the auspices of the League of Nations.

I am glad to know that the Senator still believes that we are to have contact with the world and that he is not in accord, at least at the present moment, with the mad scheme to destroy all commercial relations between the United States and other countries.

The Senator refers to the reduction in naval appropriations and states that by reason of the Conference on Limitation of Armament we have saved \$25,000,000 per annum. Mr. President, I think the Senator misconceives the scope and results of this conference. Our naval appropriations prior to the war were less than \$200,000,000 per annum. Our naval appropriations since the war have averaged more than \$300,000,000 annually. For the next fiscal year there will be directly appropriated approximately \$300,000,000, and the authorizations will total approximately \$100,000,000. Certainly the Senator can not take much comfort when he examines our naval budget.

It is true that under the terms of the treaty negotiated at the conference provision was made to limit the number of capital ships. There was no limitation, however, upon aircraft, submarines, cruisers, and many other forms of naval craft. The fact is that many of the greatest naval experts perceived that the capital ship was no longer to occupy the important place in naval programs that it had done in pre-war days. The war had shown the importance of submarines and airplanes and mines and how impotent battleships were when distant from their home ports and when unprotected by submarines, destroyers, airplanes, and other modern devices. The United States, as well as Japan, Great Britain, France, and Italy, are now expending large sums for submarines and airplanes and airplane carriers. It is believed by many that the gains from the conference are insignificant; that millions which would have been spent in battleships will now be expended for other naval craft. We know that Great Britain's budget for the next fiscal year calls for a very large appropriation to build submarines and airplanes. My recollection is that more than \$100,000,000 will be expended for this purpose alone. Japan is spending a very large sum for submarines and airplanes, and France has embarked upon a construction program for naval craft which will seriously embarrass her because of her present financial situation.

If I had time I think I could show the Senator that the Limitation of Armament Conference is not entitled to the high praise which he has awarded it.

I was somewhat amazed at the reference of the Senator to the World Court. He states that he favors the suggestion of the President that the United States should become a member of that tribunal. Mr. President, nearly two years ago I introduced a resolution in the Senate calling for an adherence upon the part of the United States to the protocol which would take our Nation into the World Court. This resolution received no support from the Republican Party. I do not recall a single Republican who favored it. The resolution contained the same provisions, stipulations, and reservations as were recommended by Secretary Hughes and adopted by President Harding. And I may add that President Coolidge has likewise adopted these reservations. I followed textually, as I recall, in the resolution which I offered, the reservations prepared by Secretary



Hughes. After considerable maneuvering I succeeded, over the opposition of the Republicans in the Senate, in obtaining a vote upon my resolution. Every Republican who voted voted against the resolution, including the Senator from Illinois. Every Democrat but three who voted supported my resolution.

On May 20, 1924, I offered the same resolution. It was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, where it has slumbered ever since. Hearings were had by that committee upon the question of entering the World Court, but it refused to report the resolution or a similar one, which was later offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON]. Indeed, it is well known that the Republicans on the committee were opposed to my resolution, or to any step which would take our Nation into the World Court.

I submit that the Republican Party is opposed to that wise and proper step. It has indulged in a pious gesture, but has stubbornly refused to permit the United States to become a member of the World Court. Notwithstanding the fact that many of the liberal forces of the United States, great religious organizations, and millions of patriotic citizens have urged favorable action, Republican leaders refused and still refuse to pass the necessary resolution to accomplish that end. I challenge the good faith of Republicans when they say that their party favors the United States becoming a member of the World Court. The Democrats in the Senate have favored, and still favor, the admission to the statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice which was adopted by the Assembly of the League of Nations on December 13, 1920, and they will again demand action upon the resolution calling for our entrance into the World Court.

The Senator from Illinois praises the Fordney-McCumber tariff law. Mr. President, that iniquitous legislation was dictated by the tariff barons and the predatory interests. It imposed burdens upon the American people of more than \$4,000,000,000 annually. It robs the consumers and adds to the swollen fortunes of great corporations and monopolies. It increased the prices upon thousands of commodities essential to the life and welfare of the people. It interposed obstacles to the operation of the natural laws of supply and demand. It was a selfish, soulless, greedy law, under which the people were exploited by profiteering manufacturers and corporations.

The Senator says that it has furnished employment to the people. Statistics show that 20 per cent of labor is unemployed in the United States, and daily we are advised of a reduction of wages in manufacturing centers. I have collated figures, but I shall not take the time of the Senate to present them, showing that wages have been reduced from 5 to 20 per cent by the New England manufacturers since the last election. The chairman of the Republican National Committee, who is from Massachusetts, is engaged, as I understand, in the manufacturing business, as are several other Senators upon the other side of the aisle. I think they can verify what I have said concerning the reduction of wages in manufacturing industries in New England since the last election. Senators doubtless have seen newspaper reports, as I have seen them, stating that the prices of cotton and woolen goods and other manufactured products in this same district have been advanced or will be advanced from 5 to 10 per cent.

My genial friend from Illinois seems to derive great pleasure from the condition of agriculture under the Republican administration. It is interesting to observe that he says the Republican Party pledged itself to enact measures to place agricultural interests on a basis of economic equality with other industries, and he adds that the President proceeded to formulate plans for the relief and benefit of agriculture. He refers to the committee appointed by the President and to the comprehensive legislative program which has been submitted to carry out the pledge of the Republican Party made to the farmers before the election. Mr. President, if the situation of the farmers were not so serious one would be amused at the position of the Senator from Illinois. Senators will note that the Republican Party was pledged to aid the farmers, and that President Coolidge has formulated a plan to redeem that pledge, and then we are told that the pledge has been redeemed by the comprehensive plan submitted by the committee appointed by the President to investigate agricultural conditions.

It is this comprehensive program to which Mr. Mark Sullivan refers in the article which has formed the text of what I have said this morning. Senators will recall that this comprehensive plan calls for a policy of national isolation. The commission appointed by the President recommends that the tariff rates be raised to higher levels, that all agricultural products are to be excluded from the United States by an embargo, and, as a corollary, that an embargo be placed upon

all exports so that the United States can obtain that high standard of perfection and happiness and prosperity which will follow its severance of all relations with the rest of the world.

The Senator's inconsistency is strikingly revealed. He speaks of the Interparliamentary Union and the World Court, and then notes the plan which he says the President has formulated and which his party's platform was pledged to execute—a policy which literally, physically, and intellectually, culturally and spiritually, is to separate the United States from all other countries and people.

The Senator has confirmed all I have said about the purposes of the Republican Party. I denounce this plan as un-American, as violative of the principles of the Constitution, and as destructive of economic and political liberty. The American people when they perceive its pernicious features and its destructive and vicious consequences, I feel sure, will repudiate it, as they will those who are its sponsors and who are seeking to fasten it upon the American people.

Mr. President, the speech of the Senator from Illinois calls for a more extended reply, but I shall not consume more of the time of the Senate now in so doing. I want to briefly refer to another matter discussed by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS].

The bill under discussion makes provision for the Tariff Commission. This agency of the Government can be of great service if it is properly organized, if its personnel are properly selected, and if its activities are confined to legitimate fields of inquiry.

For many years prior to the creation of this commission there was a demand by liberal and patriotic citizens that a tariff commission should be appointed, authorized to obtain facts in regard to the cost of production and cognate questions that would be helpful to Congress in enacting tariff legislation. There was a growing feeling that tariff bills had been drafted by those who would be benefited by high tariff rates. Indeed, it was known that many of the tariff schedules were written by protected interests. The rates fixed in many schedules had been placed so high as to practically exclude any foreign competition. The domestic producers were therefore given a free hand to rob and exploit the American consumers. These abuses could no longer continue. The Payne-Aldrich tariff law was denounced throughout the land as an oppressive and, indeed, a wicked measure. It was condemned by some Republicans, and Theodore Roosevelt, who was always a protectionist, felt compelled to denounce its iniquities. It was hoped that a tariff commission would make impossible the enactment of such unjust measures.

Mr. President, I submit that the facts warrant the statement that the Republican administration has attempted to make of this agency a partisan machine to aid in framing tariff measures that would permit the exploitation of the American consumers. It is evident that an effort is being made to convert this commission into an auxiliary agency of the protected interests in the United States. If that scheme is to be consummated, it would be better to abolish the commission. The commission should be a fact-finding organization. It should investigate the costs of production and obtain data useful in preparing tariff bills.

The tariff is not so intricate and so abstruse as to be beyond the comprehension of the ordinary man. Representatives of the protected interests have attempted to surround the tariff question with such mystery as to make people believe that it could only be penetrated by experts and persons skilled in the art of legerdemain. And it must be confessed that they have succeeded; and they have so drafted tariff schedules as to obscure the real meaning and hide provisions which made certain their opportunities to further exploit the people.

Undoubtedly at the next session of Congress a tariff bill will be considered. If the Tariff Commission had the confidence of the people, it could be an important aid in the preparation of such a measure. If those appointed by the President are selected because of their partisan views, or because they have been representatives of protected interests, or lobbyists before Congress to secure high tariff duties, then their work will be discredited in advance and their service to Congress and the country will be of no value. Indeed, it will prove harmful. It has been said that pressure has been brought to bear upon members of the Tariff Commission calculated to have them shape their course and their decisions along certain lines. In my opinion, those who would make such attempt commit a great wrong. The commission should be as free from bias and prejudice and extraneous influences as are judges. Particularly is this true in view of what are known as the flexible provisions of the tariff law. They and the President can make and un-

make tariff schedules; they can increase or lower the rates fixed by Congress. It is a tremendous power to vest in the President, a power which I think the Constitution does not authorize. Even if there was constitutional warrant for this course, it would, in my opinion, be exceedingly unwise. But its un wisdom is accentuated if the commission is partisan and is subject to pressure and political influences.

Mr. President, I express the hope that the Tariff Commission will faithfully meet its responsibilities and pursue a course that will vindicate the wisdom of those who created it.

#### REPORT OF AGRICULTURAL COMMISSION

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article from Wallace's Farmer upon the report of the President's agricultural commission. Wallace's Farmer is a paper formerly published by Secretary Wallace, deceased Secretary of Agriculture, now published by his brother and son.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURSUM in the chair). Is there objection to the printing of the article? The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is here printed, as follows:

[From Wallace's Farmer]

#### THE COMMISSION REPORTS

Since President Coolidge's speech of acceptance last summer farm folks generally have awaited with some eagerness the results of the work of the agricultural commission, whose appointment he promised in that address. The delay in the appointment of the commission aroused some apprehension. More disquiet was occasioned when the names of the members of the commission were finally made public after election. It was quite clear from the make-up of the commission that Secretary Wallace had had very little to do with its selection; it was also quite clear that Secretary Hoover had had a good deal to do with it. The absence of corn-belt representatives from the board was also taken as a bad sign.

Farmers have hoped that the commission would realize its responsibility and its opportunity and would come through with a program that would get down to the fundamentals of the agricultural situation. The report is now out and farmers can see how far their hopes exceeded the reality.

In fairness to the commission it should be said that it has made some good recommendations. Its suggestions as to lower freight rates, tariff adjustments on farm products, funds for research are all right as far as they go. All these matters were before Congress anyway, as it happens, and the commission's recommendations will perhaps speed their passage.

Of the main feature of the report, the recommendation for setting up a governmental agency to supervise and control cooperatives, not so much can be said. This is Secretary Hoover's old Capper-Williams bill, slightly modified. It is a scheme that has been denounced by practically every important farm organization in the country. The cooperatives do not want it.

Why, then, the recommendation? As the proposal stands, it seems nothing more or less than a thinly disguised attempt to take marketing work out of the hands of the Department of Agriculture. All the things of value that the new bureau would do are already being done by the bureau of agricultural economics of the Department of Agriculture. The natural and economical step would be to strengthen this work rather than to set up a separate bureau. However, the purpose seems to be, not so much to strengthen cooperative marketing as to put supervision and guidance of cooperative marketing of farm products in the hands of the Department of Commerce.

The great failure of the commission, however, is its disregard of the really fundamental problem that lies at the bottom of unsatisfactory agricultural conditions to-day. So long as we produce a surplus of food products over what our home population can consume, and so long as the buying power of Europe is lower than the buying power of the home consumer, we are going to have our domestic prices brought down to the level of the European price, less freight and handling charges. That means disaster for the farmer. He can not afford to buy in a protected market and sell in a world market. Yet that is what he has been doing and is doing.

Apparently, the commission looked at this problem and threw up its hands and turned its back. Either it couldn't solve the problem, or, what is more likely, didn't dare try. Yet it had before it the plan submitted by the American council of agriculture, outlining a modified export plan which eliminated many of the objections of the old McNary-Haugen bill and offered a real chance to take the market depressing burden of the exportable surplus off the back of the American farmer.

It will seem incredible to thoughtful students of the agricultural situation that the commission refused to touch this issue. Yet there the record stands. But, although the commission refused to recognize it, the problem still exists. The farmer must face it, even if the commission declines to.

What can the farmer do to get rid of the depressing effect of this exportable surplus on the home market? He can, of course, in time get rid of the surplus itself. That may be the ultimate solution. But to restrict supply to domestic demand at once and in all lines, means a revolution in agriculture; such a reduction would be impossible except through such phenomenally low prices that thousands more of farmers would be made bankrupt and driven to the cities; it would mean a period of farm distress even worse than that we have been through. More than this, such a program involves a tremendous social waste. In a decade, our city population will be large enough to consume a quantity of food as large as that we are producing to-day. In a few years, therefore, our farmers who had been driven to the city by low prices would be lured back to dismantled farms by high prices.

Why not eliminate that social waste, prevent the bankruptcy of thousands of farmers, and aim to keep a certain small exportable surplus at least as a reserve against crop failure and population increase? The new export bill provides that the Government export corporation, acting through privately owned or cooperative concerns, shall take such steps as are necessary to maintain the domestic price of any farm product at a point at least as high as the world price plus the tariff. This is making the tariff effective on farm products; it is equality for agriculture; it is the logical answer to the export problem; it is also, unfortunately, what the President's commission refused to do.

The friends of the export plan have been very patient so far. They have declined to introduce their bill in Congress. They have insisted on giving the commission a fair chance to take the lead with its report. There is no reason now for further delay. We look for the new export bill to be introduced in Congress at once. Behind it should gather all the farmers of the country who are tired of being fed with pleasant words and clothed with good intentions. When they ask for speedy action on the export bill, they will ask for nothing more than equality with other industries; they will demand nothing less than justice. It is to the interest of all that they secure it.

#### PROPOSED CONSOLIDATIONS OF CERTAIN RAILROADS

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HOWELL. I ask unanimous consent to introduce a resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to introduce a resolution. Without objection, the resolution will be received and read.

The resolution (S. Res. 338) was read, as follows:

Whereas there is now in process of formation a consolidation of the following railroads, namely, the New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Co. (the Nickel Plate), the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., the Hocking Valley Railway Co., the Erie Railroad Co., and the Pere Marquette Railway Co., with total trackage of 14,357 miles and assets alleged by the promoters to amount to an aggregate of \$1,406,763,792, the proposed consolidation being known in financial circles as "the new Nickel Plate"; and

Whereas this consolidation includes a previous merger consummated in 1923 whereby the "Nickel Plate" absorbed the Chicago & State Line, the Lake Erie & Western, the Fort Wayne, Cincinnati & Louisville, and the Toledo, St. Louis & Western (Clover Leaf) railroad companies; and

Whereas the fiscal agents and financial promoters of this plan are J. P. Morgan & Co. and the First National Bank of New York City, which already own or control a large part of the railroad properties located in the Eastern States as well as in other sections of the country; and

Whereas the proposed "Nickel Plate" consolidation under the announced plan will result in giving the Morgan-First National financiers, according to statements appearing in the financial columns of the New York American of August 9, 1924, control of railroads in the Eastern States alone with 37,000 miles of road and approximately \$3,000,000,000 of capital, thus creating a substantial control of transportation in this great industrial territory; and

Whereas the railroads included in the proposed Nickel Plate merger, particularly the Erie, Chesapeake & Ohio, and the Hocking Valley, are directly or indirectly owners of enormous and immensely valuable anthracite and bituminous coal properties, control of which it is indicated will be transferred in the proposed merger; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has denounced such control of coal mines by railroads as inimical to the public interest; and

Whereas the proposed consolidation by further concentrating this control of the Nation's fuel supply increasingly endangers the rights of the consuming public; and

Whereas the plan of consolidation now proposed by the Van Swearingen interests, with the support of the Morgan-First National banking groups, violates the plans of consolidation heretofore announced by the Interstate Commerce Commission under the authority conferred by section 5 of the interstate commerce act as amended by the trans-



portation act of 1920, and if carried out along the lines now laid down will make it impossible for the commission to provide for effectively competing systems in the territory traversed by the proposed consolidation; and

Whereas Commissioners Eastman, Hall, and Esch, in a vigorous dissenting opinion filed June 18, 1923, in the case of the preceding Nickel Plate-Clover Leaf consolidation (finance docket No. 2919), denounced that lesser merger as inimical to the public interest and a violation of the intent of Congress as declared in the transportation act; and

Whereas the majority of the Interstate Commerce Commission in their decision in this Nickel Plate-Clover Leaf consolidation case declared their inability to restrain or modify mergers consummated under State laws, and thus apparently abdicated the broad powers conferred upon said commission by section 5 of the interstate commerce act; and

Whereas the Interstate Commerce Commission in its recent decision in the case of control of Gulf lines by Missouri Pacific Railroad (finance docket No. 4049), in pointing out that certain bankers—W. A. Harriman & Co. (Inc.) and Blair & Co. (Inc.)—under the proposed terms would make an unwarranted profit of \$1,225,000 on the total issue of \$18,000,000, has declared: "There are certain aspects of the method by which it is proposed that the applicant shall acquire the stock in question which are so unfortunate as to cause hesitancy in giving approval to the acquisition of the stock involved on the terms proposed"; and

Whereas the majority of the commission, in spite of the powers expressly conferred upon it by paragraph 6 of section 5 of the interstate commerce act to approve such consolidations, "with such modifications and upon such terms and conditions as it may prescribe," has declared, "We have no jurisdiction to determine the compensation which the bankers should receive," and over the vigorous dissenting opinions of Commissioners Eastman, McManamy, and Campbell has after only five days' consideration given its sanction to such excessive underwriting commissions and thus set a precedent which unjustly reduces the profits of honest investors, imposes excessive charges upon shippers and the traveling public, and obstructs the payment of just and reasonable wages to employees; and

Whereas the New York Times of December 12, 1924, has stated in its financial columns that the profits of the bankers in the Missouri Pacific-Gulf Coast merger will actually be \$3,250,000 on the \$18,000,000 stock issue instead of \$1,225,000, as estimated by the commission; and

Whereas it is apparent from the above decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission that it feels powerless under existing conditions to cope with the problems presented by such consolidations; and

Whereas the negotiations in the proposed "Nickel Plate" consolidation are now being privately conducted by the promoters, who reveal the terms and conditions only when they are accomplished facts; and

Whereas the precedents established in these consolidations which are now taking place will control future consolidations which may ultimately embrace all the railroads of the Nation; and

Whereas the public interest demands that the Congress should inform itself fully regarding such consolidations and take such steps as may be necessary in the premises:

*Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and it is hereby, authorized and instructed in connection with its proposed inquiry into the general question of railroad consolidations to investigate particularly the proposed consolidation of the New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad, the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co., the Hocking Valley Railway Co., the Erie Railroad Co., and the Pere Marquette Railway Co., and the consolidations which have been or are now being consummated by the Missouri Pacific Railroad, and report its findings and recommendations to the Senate. For the purpose of this investigation the said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to sit and perform its duties at such times and places as it deems necessary or proper and to require the attendance of witnesses by subpoenas or otherwise, to require the production of books, papers, and documents; to employ experts and other assistants; and to employ stenographers, at a cost not exceeding \$1.25 per printed page. The chairman of the committee, or any member thereof, may administer oaths to witnesses and sign subpoenas for witnesses, and every person duly summoned before said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, who refuses or fails to obey the process of said committee, or appears and refuses to answer questions pertinent to said investigation shall be punished as prescribed by law. The expenses of said investigation shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers of the committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman and approved by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. HOWELL. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be so referred.

#### QUARANTINE STATION AT PORT OF MOBILE, ALA.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Out of order, I ask unanimous consent to report back favorably, with an amendment, from the Committee on Commerce, House bill 8090, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to remove the quarantine station now situated at Fort Morgan, Ala., to Sand Island, near the entrance to the port of Mobile, Ala., and to construct thereon a new quarantine station; and I submit a report (No. 1103) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a request for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, for this reason: Mobile, of course, is one of the ports of entry from South America. It is one of the guarding gates against yellow fever and other diseases of that kind. The storms have practically destroyed the quarantine station at Fort Morgan. The Treasury Department has thought it ill-advised to rebuild the station at Fort Morgan, which is 18 miles down the bay from Mobile, and subject to storms, for that reason and also for the reason that the Army has abandoned Fort Morgan, and there is no transportation down there, and if it is continued the Army must establish transportation service to the quarantine station. So they have recommended the erection of the station on this island, right in front of Mobile.

It is urgent, and something should be done. The State of Alabama has given the land on which the building is to be erected. The House passed the bill with an authorization for the appropriation of \$500,000. The Senate committee, I understand, unanimously recommended the passage of the bill, but cut the authorization to \$300,000. It is very urgent that this action should be taken at once. The authorization must be made before the appropriation can go into an appropriation bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, on page 2, line 2, before the word "which," to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$300,000," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be constructed on a site now owned by the United States Government on Sand Island, near the entrance of the port of Mobile, Ala., or on such site on this island as may hereafter be ceded to the United States by the State of Alabama, a quarantine station at a cost for station, dredging, and all other improvements and appurtenances provided for by this act not exceeding \$300,000, which amount is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby further authorized to accept title for and on behalf of the United States to such additional lands on Sand Island as may be ceded by the State of Alabama to the United States for use as a national quarantine station as aforesaid.

Sec. 2. That the said quarantine station shall include such wharves, bulkheads, buildings and equipment, water supply, electric-lighting system, telephone cable, heating and sewage systems, and the dredging of a channel leading to the proposed wharves, and such other facilities as may be deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Treasury for the proper operation of a quarantine station: *Provided*, That \$40,000 of the amount herein authorized to be appropriated may be used for miscellaneous furnishing and equipment.

Sec. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized to transfer and remove such furniture, equipment, articles, and materials as may be useful in the construction and equipment of the new quarantine station at Sand Island, Ala., from the quarantine station now maintained at Fort Morgan, Ala., and make such disposition of the building, site, and equipment at Fort Morgan, Ala., at such time and on such terms as he may deem to be to the best interests of the Government.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Washington why the amount was cut down to \$300,000? I understand that as the bill came from the House it authorized an appropriation of \$500,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Secretary of the Treasury looked into the matter very carefully and reported to the committee that he thought he could take care of the situation properly with \$300,000, and for that reason we cut it down to that amount.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

#### USE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED RADIO STATIONS

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, there are two other measures I desire to report from the Committee on Commerce, and I shall ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

The first one is Senate Joint Resolution 177, to amend section 2 of the public resolution entitled "Joint resolution to authorize the operation of Government-owned radio stations for the use of the general public, and for other purposes," approved April 14, 1922. I report it without amendment, and I submit a report (No. 1104) thereon.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I notice that the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] is rather assuming to farm out his time without losing his place on the floor. It is useless to attempt to proceed further with the appropriation bill this evening, and I ask that the bill be laid aside, with the understanding that we will recess at the conclusion of our business to-day. Therefore the Senator from Washington may proceed with his bill.

Mr. KING. I want to call the attention of the Senator from Wyoming to the rather unfair language which he uses. I am not "farming out" my time. As a matter of courtesy I yielded to several of his colleagues at their request. If the Senator wants to find fault with them, he can do so. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I spoke to the Senator from Utah about the matter.

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest to the Senator from Washington that he have the bills reported separately, so that we may consider them one at a time.

Mr. WARREN. The appropriation bill may be laid aside for the day, so far as I am concerned.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As the Chair understands, the Senator from Wyoming lays aside the appropriation bill with which the Senate has been proceeding.

Mr. SMOOT. For the evening.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The first measure I report is Senate Joint Resolution 177, extending the time limit for the use of Government-owned radio stations for certain purposes.

Under the law as it exists now, the Navy radio stations are used for the transmission of messages other than Government messages, commercial and otherwise. The time within which that can be done will expire June 30, 1925. There are certain private radio stations being constructed, but they have not been completed and probably will not be completed for over a year. It is very important, of course, that messages be sent, and this is especially true of messages to be sent across the Pacific to the Far East.

This joint resolution would extend the time until 1926 for the transmission by the Government radio of news items, press items, and messages between ships offshore and the shore. I present the report and ask for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. ROBINSON. I do not see any objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That section 2 of public resolution No. 48, Sixty-seventh Congress, approved April 14, 1922, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized, under the terms and conditions and at rates prescribed by him, which rates shall be just and reasonable, and which, upon complaint, shall be subject to review and revision by the Interstate Commerce Commission, to use all radio stations and apparatus, wherever located, owned by the United States and under the control of the Navy Department (a) for the reception and transmission of press messages offered by any newspaper published in the United States, its Territories or possessions, or published by citizens of the United States in foreign countries, or by any press association of the United States, and (b) for the reception and transmission of private commercial messages between ships and between ship and shore: *Provided*, That the rates fixed for the reception and transmission of all such messages, other than press messages between the Pacific coast of the United States, Hawaii, Alaska, the Philippine Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the Orient, shall not be

less than the rates charged by privately owned and operated stations for like messages and service: *Provided further*, That the right to use such stations for any of the purposes named in this section shall terminate and cease as between any countries or localities or between any locality and privately operated ships whenever privately owned and operated stations are capable of meeting the normal communication requirements between such countries or localities or between any locality and privately operated ships, and the Secretary of Commerce shall have notified the Secretary of the Navy thereof, and in any event all rights conferred by this section shall terminate and cease on June 30, 1927, except that all such rights conferred by this section in the Republic of China shall terminate and cease on January 1, 1924."

Mr. FLETCHER. Is the joint resolution recommended by the department?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is recommended by the department.

Mr. ROBINSON. And it was unanimously reported by the committee?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; unanimously reported.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### HOME PORTS FOR VESSELS

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I report also from the Committee on Commerce the bill (S. 4162) to establish home ports of vessels of the United States, to validate documents relating to such vessels, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1105) thereon.

This bill relates to home ports of vessels, and an enactment of such legislation is made necessary by a recent decision of the circuit court of appeals, under which the validity of mortgages on vessels is very greatly endangered.

I will read from the report of the Secretary:

This bill \* \* \* has been approved after very close consideration by the Maritime Law Association of the United States, the Shipping Board, representatives of the Ship Owners' Association, the Lake Carriers' Association of the Great Lakes, various admiralty firms interested in the subject, and by this department, as meeting the emergency caused by the decision of the circuit court of appeals at Norfolk in a very recent case of the *Susana*.

Mr. ROBINSON. Can the Senator state what the bill would accomplish, what change in existing law it would make?

Mr. JONES of Washington. This is the effect of the decision, as stated by the Secretary.

The effect of the decision is this:

A mortgage recorded in the port of New York upon a vessel owned by a Delaware corporation is invalid as to third parties, whether as a preferred mortgage or as an ordinary mortgage, even though the vessel is documented at the port of New York.

Again:

A vessel owned by a New York corporation and duly documented at the port of New York loses its status as a vessel of the United States if it is sold to a Delaware corporation and is not redocumented at a port in Delaware.

A mortgage, whether preferred or ordinary, upon a vessel which has lost her status as a vessel of the United States is invalid as to third parties.

That is, under this decision. It is said further:

There are at present 152 corporations operating 803 vessels of over 3,000,000 gross tons which are improperly documented under this decision. \* \* \*

The bill speaks for itself, really, and provides as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That for the purposes of the navigation laws of the United States and of the ship mortgage act, 1920, otherwise known as section 30 of the merchant marine act, 1920, every vessel of the United States shall have a "home port" in the United States, including Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico, which port the owner of such vessel, subject to the approval of the commissioner of navigation of the Department of Commerce, shall specifically fix and determine, and subject to such approval may from time to time change. Such home port shall be shown in the register, enrollment, and license, or license of such vessel, which documents, respectively, are hereinafter referred to as the vessel's document. The home port shown in the document of any vessel of the United States in force at the time of the approval of this act shall be deemed to have been fixed and determined in accordance with the provisions hereof. Section 4141 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to conform herewith.

SEC. 2. No bill of sale, conveyance, mortgage, assignment of mortgage, or hypothecation (except bottomry), which includes a vessel of the United States or any portion thereof, shall be valid in respect to such vessel against any person other than the grantor or mortgagor,



his heirs or devisees, and any person having actual notice thereof, until such bill of sale, conveyance, mortgage, assignment of mortgage, or hypothecation is recorded in the office of the collector of customs at the home port of such vessel. Any bill of sale or conveyance of the whole or any part of a vessel shall be recorded at the home port of such vessel as shown in her new document.

SEC. 3. All conveyances and mortgages of any vessel or any part thereof, and all documentations, recordings, indorsements, and indexing thereof, and proceedings incidental thereto heretofore made or done, are hereby declared valid to the extent they would have been valid if the port or ports at which said vessel has in fact been documented from time to time had been the port or ports at which it should have been documented in accordance with law; and this section is hereby declared retroactive so as to accomplish such validation: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to deprive any person of any vested right.

SEC. 4. Wherever in the ship mortgage act, 1920, otherwise known as section 30 of the merchant marine act, 1920, the words "port of documentation" are used they shall be deemed to mean the "home port" of the vessel, except that the words "port of documentation" shall not include a port in which a temporary document is issued.

SEC. 5. All such provisions of the navigation laws of the United States and of the ship mortgage act, 1920, otherwise known as section 30 of the merchant marine act, 1920, as are in conflict with this act are hereby amended to conform herewith.

This bill is designed to correct the decision to which I have referred. I have a letter from the judge who rendered the decision urging that such legislation be enacted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### SUITS FOR DAMAGES CAUSED BY UNITED STATES VESSELS

Mr. BAYARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 9535, authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty for damage caused by and salvage services rendered to public vessels belonging to the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment in section 1, page 1, line 9, after the word "April," to strike out "1920" and insert "1917," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That a libel in personam in admiralty may be brought against the United States, or a petition impleading the United States, for damages caused by a public vessel of the United States, and for compensation for towage and salvage services, including contract salvage, rendered to a public vessel of the United States: *Provided*, That the cause of action arose after the 6th day of April, 1917.

SEC. 2. That such suit shall be brought in the district court of the United States for the district in which the vessel or cargo charged with creating the liability is found within the United States, or if such vessel or cargo be outside the territorial waters of the United States, then in the district court of the United States for the district in which the parties so suing, or any of them, reside or have an office for the transaction of business in the United States; or in case none of such parties reside or have an office for the transaction of business in the United States, and such vessel or cargo be outside the territorial waters of the United States, then in any district court of the United States. Such suits shall be subject to and proceed in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty, suits for salvage services, and providing for the release of merchant vessels belonging to the United States from arrest and attachment in foreign jurisdictions, and for other purposes," approved March 9, 1920, or any amendment thereof, in so far as the same are not inconsistent herewith, except that no interest shall be allowed on any claim up to the time of the rendition of judgment unless upon a contract expressly stipulating for the payment of interest.

SEC. 3. That in the event of the United States filing a libel in rem or in personam in admiralty for damages caused by a privately owned vessel, the owner of such vessel, or his successors in interest, may file a cross libel in personam or claim a set-off or counterclaim against the United States in such suit for and on account of any damages arising out of the same subject matter or cause of action: *Provided*, That whenever a cross libel is filed for any cause of action for which the original libel is filed by authority of this act, the respondent in the cross libel shall give security in the usual amount and form to

respond to the claim set forth in said cross libel unless the court, for cause shown, shall otherwise direct; and all proceedings on the original libel shall be stayed until such security shall be given.

SEC. 4. That no officer or member of the crew of any public vessel of the United States may be subpoenaed in connection with any suit authorized under this act without the consent of the secretary of the department or the head of any independent establishment of the Government having control of the vessel at the time the cause of action arose, or of the master or commanding officer of such vessel at the time of the issuance of such subpoena.

SEC. 5. That no suit may be brought under this act by a national of any foreign government unless it shall appear to the satisfaction of the court in which suit is brought that said government, under similar circumstances, allows nationals of the United States to sue in its courts.

SEC. 6. That the Attorney General of the United States is hereby authorized to arbitrate, compromise, or settle any claim on which a libel or cross libel would lie under the provisions of this act, and for which a libel or cross libel has actually been filed.

SEC. 7. That any final judgment rendered on any libel or cross libel herein authorized, and any settlement had and agreed to under the provisions of section 6 of this act, shall, upon presentation of a duly authenticated copy thereof, be paid by the proper accounting officer of the United States out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States appropriated therefor by Congress.

SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to recognize the existence of or as creating a lien against any public vessel of the United States.

SEC. 9. The United States shall be entitled to the benefits of all exemptions and of all limitations of liability accorded by law to the owners, charterers, operators, or agents of vessels.

SEC. 10. That the Attorney General of the United States shall report to the Congress at each session thereof all suits in which final judgment shall have been rendered and all claims which shall have been settled under this act.

Mr. ROBINSON. I think the Senator from Delaware should state briefly to the Senate the effect of the bill. It seems to be a measure of considerable importance.

Mr. BAYARD. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas is quite right; it is a measure of great importance. There are continuous applications being made to the Claims Committee of both Houses for the consideration of bills to reimburse people who have suffered damage from maritime accidents in which United States vessels are concerned, to enable them to present their suits in the various district courts. In this last Congress there were nearly 200 such claim bills introduced in the two Houses.

Outside of that, there are many claims which must be settled by the Department of State, because our own nationals are forbidden going into our own courts, and the nationals of other countries can not come in, and this bill is to remedy that situation. It would give a person aggrieved because of an accident by reason of the shortcomings of a United States ship the right to go into a district court and prosecute his action. It provides for the appearance of the Attorney General of the United States, and all maritime accidents of any kind resulting from collision, and so on, are taken care of. A great deal of money would be saved to the Government.

Incidentally, the bill would accomplish something which should have been done in this country a long time ago. It would give an opportunity to do justice when Federal employees have committed an offense against an individual. It is recommended by the Secretary of State, the Department of Commerce, by the Shipping Board, by the Navy Department, and by the War Department.

Mr. ROBINSON. If enacted, it would relieve Congress of the consideration of a great many measures in the nature of private claims.

Mr. BAYARD. All claims of this nature.

Mr. ROBINSON. The report is unanimous?

Mr. BAYARD. It is unanimous. The bill passed the House unanimously a short time ago.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### PURCHASE OF UNAPPROPRIATED PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 9765, granting to certain claimants the preference right to purchase unappropriated public lands.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with amendments, which were, in section 1, page 1, line 10, to strike out "or whose predecessor in interest" and insert "or whose ancestors in title"; on page 2, line 11, after the word "from," to insert "official notice to such claimant of"; in line 15, after the word "claimant," to insert "or in the actual possession of a person or persons who have improved the property and who have attempted to enter same in compliance with the laws and regulations of the United States land office"; and on page 3, line 7, after the word "within," to strike out "30 days" and insert "6 months," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior, in his judgment and discretion, is hereby authorized to sell, in the manner hereinafter provided, any of those lands situated in the State of Louisiana which were originally erroneously meandered and shown upon the official plats as water-covered areas, and which are not lawfully appropriated by a qualified settler or entryman claiming under the public land laws.

That any citizen of the United States who, or whose ancestors in title in good faith under color of title or claiming as a riparian owner has, prior to this act, placed valuable improvements upon or reduced to cultivation any of the lands subject to the operation of this act, shall have a preferred right to file in the office of the register and receiver of the United States land office of the district in which the lands are situated, an application to purchase the lands thus improved by them at any time within 90 days from the date of the passage of this act if the lands have been surveyed and plats filed in the United States land office; otherwise within 90 days from official notice to such claimant of the filing of such plats. Every such application must be accompanied with satisfactory proof that the applicant is entitled to such preference right and that the lands which he applies to purchase are not in the legal possession of an adverse claimant or in the actual possession of a person or persons who have improved the property and who have attempted to enter same in compliance with the laws and regulations of the United States land office.

That upon the filing of an application to purchase any lands subject to the operation of this act, together with the required proof, the Secretary of the Interior shall cause the lands described in said application to be appraised, said appraisal to be on the basis of the value of such lands at the date of appraisal, exclusive of any increased value resulting from the development or improvement thereof for agricultural purposes by the applicant or his predecessor in interest, but inclusive of the stumpage value of any timber cut or removed by the applicant or his predecessor in interest.

That an applicant who applies to purchase lands under the provisions of this act, in order to be entitled to receive a patent, must within six months from receipt of notice of appraisal by the Secretary of the Interior pay to the receiver of the United States land office of the district in which the lands are situated the appraised price of the lands, and thereupon a patent shall issue to said applicant for such lands as the Secretary of the Interior shall determine that such applicant is entitled to purchase under this act. The proceeds derived by the Government from the sale of the lands hereunder shall be covered into the United States Treasury and applied as provided by law for the disposal of the proceeds from the sale of public lands.

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to prescribe all necessary rules and regulations for administering the provisions of this act and determining conflicting claims arising hereunder.

Sec. 2. That all purchases made and patents issued under the provisions of this act shall be subject to and contain a reservation to the United States of all the coal, oil, gas, and other minerals in the lands so purchased and patented, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

#### RECESS

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 5 o'clock p. m.) took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, February 13, 1925, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

*Executive nominations received by the Senate February 12 (legislative day of February 3), 1925*

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

##### MARINE CORPS

The following-named noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps for a probationary period of two years from the 9th day of February, 1925:

Corpl. Milo R. Carroll.  
Corpl. Floyd A. Stephenson.  
Corpl. Homer L. Litzberg, jr.  
Corpl. Wilbert S. Brown.  
Sergt. Samuel S. Ballentine.  
Gunnery Sergt. Theodore B. Millard.  
Corpl. David K. Claude.  
Corpl. Albert L. Gardner.  
Corpl. James P. S. Devereux.  
Corpl. Robert C. Orrison.

##### POSTMASTERS

##### GEORGIA

Tilden A. Adkins to be postmaster at Vienna, Ga., in place of T. A. Adkins. Incumbent's commission expired July 28, 1923.  
Robert H. Manson to be postmaster at Darien, Ga., in place of R. W. Clancy. Incumbent's commission expired February 20, 1924.

##### FLORIDA

Richard E. Damon to be postmaster at Jupiter, Fla., in place of Ethel Sims, resigned.  
Mima Gurganious to be postmaster at Lacoochee, Fla. Office became presidential January 1, 1925.

##### ILLINOIS

Richard C. Hills to be postmaster at Franklin, Ill., in place of C. F. Miller, removed.  
William A. Spickerman to be postmaster at Oak Park, Ill., in place of Robert Sherrard. Incumbent's commission expired March 9, 1924.

##### INDIANA

Minard A. Schutt to be postmaster at Michigan City, Ind., in place of H. F. Schaal, deceased.  
Fred D. Huff to be postmaster at Mellott, Ind. Office became presidential October 1, 1924.

##### KANSAS

Alex F. Holmgren to be postmaster at Lincolnville, Kans. Office became presidential July 1, 1924.

##### LOUISIANA

Joseph C. Ballay to be postmaster at Buras, La. Office became presidential January 1, 1925.

##### MASSACHUSETTS

Charles W. Cole to be postmaster at Dighton, Mass. Office became presidential January 1, 1925.

##### MINNESOTA

George H. Hopkins to be postmaster at Battle Lake, Minn., in place of G. H. Hopkins. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1924.  
Theodore Thoennes to be postmaster at Ogema, Minn. Office became presidential July 1, 1924.

##### MISSISSIPPI

Andrew V. Lamar to be postmaster at Vardaman, Miss., in place of A. V. Lamar. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1924.

Tommie A. Hamill to be postmaster at Sturgis, Miss., in place of T. A. Hamill. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1924.  
James F. Jones to be postmaster at Shubuta, Miss., in place of J. F. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1924.

Sarah M. Gryder to be postmaster at Shannon, Miss., in place of J. H. Wiygul. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1924.

James W. Bell, jr., to be postmaster at University, Miss., in place of W. C. Falkner, resigned.

William P. Jones to be postmaster at Terry, Miss., in place of S. B. Thomas, resigned.

Katherine M. Alvis to be postmaster at Rienzi, Miss., in place of J. McF. Curlee, appointee declined.

Fred W. Whitfield to be postmaster at Picayune, Miss., in place of L. J. Megehee, resigned.

Johnnie L. Posey to be postmaster at Philadelphia, Miss., in place of T. C. Barrier, deceased.



Robert J. Delpit to be postmaster at Pass Christian, Miss., in place of E. J. Adam, resigned.

Albert S. Johnston to be postmaster at Carthage, Miss., in place of L. V. Stribling, resigned.

Maude Barton to be postmaster at Mathiston, Miss., in place of W. L. Atkins, resigned.

Albert S. Russell to be postmaster at Magee, Miss., in place of A. P. Russell, resigned.

Wiley S. Davis to be postmaster at Lyman, Miss., in place of W. L. Fox, resigned.

Sara B. Townes to be postmaster at Glendora, Miss., in place of M. U. Dollins, removed.

John R. Terry to be postmaster at Dundee, Miss., in place of S. L. Pake, resigned.

William T. Pearce to be postmaster at Amory, Miss., in place of H. F. Clarke, deceased.

Thomas W. Cooper to be postmaster at Purvis, Miss., in place of T. W. Cooper. Incumbent's commission expired February 4, 1924.

Virginia B. Buckworth to be postmaster at Prentiss, Miss., in place of V. B. Buckworth. Incumbent's commission expired July 28, 1923.

Elma M. Lindinger to be postmaster at Pascagoula, Miss., in place of W. T. Sparkman. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1924.

John P. Edwards to be postmaster at Ocean Springs, Miss., in place of L. M. McClure. Incumbent's commission expired July 28, 1923.

Carson Hughes to be postmaster at Oakland, Miss., in place of Carson Hughes. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1924.

Pearl Young to be postmaster at Noxapater, Miss., in place of Pearl Young. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1924.

Fred H. Laseter to be postmaster at Morton, Miss., in place of Nannie Stuart. Incumbent's commission expired August 20, 1923.

Willis L. Malley to be postmaster at Merigold, Miss., in place of H. R. Tatum. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1924.

Maggie E. Sullivan to be postmaster at Meadville, Miss., in place of M. E. Sullivan. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1924.

Thomas C. Moore to be postmaster at Macon, Miss., in place of H. H. Hunter. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1924.

Emmett L. Van Landingham to be postmaster at McCool, Miss., in place of H. M. Drane. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1924.

Walter L. Holmes to be postmaster at McComb, Miss., in place of W. W. Holmes. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1924.

Isaac N. Joyner to be postmaster at Houlika, Miss., in place of M. S. Walker. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1924.

Sarah L. Townsend to be postmaster at Holcomb, Miss., in place of S. L. Townsend. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1924.

Jefferson D. Fogg to be postmaster at Hernando, Miss., in place of J. D. Fogg. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1924.

Bennett A. Truly to be postmaster at Fayette, Miss., in place of B. A. Truly. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1924.

Bessie H. Ballard to be postmaster at Edwards, Miss., in place of M. L. Tatum. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1924.

Minnie Davis to be postmaster at Duncan, Miss., in place of Minnie Davis. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1924.

Mellon E. Daniel to be postmaster at Dio, Miss., in place of M. E. Daniel. Incumbent's commission expired June 2, 1924.

Robert F. McMullan to be postmaster at Decatur, Miss., in place of McCreight Dansby. Incumbent's commission expired August 20, 1923.

Harry L. Callicott to be postmaster at Coldwater, Miss., in place of H. L. Callicott. Incumbent's commission expired June 4, 1924.

James G. Carr to be postmaster at Centerville, Miss., in place of A. J. Darden. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1924.

Reid R. Williams to be postmaster at Arcola, Miss., in place of C. B. Lee. Incumbent's commission expired January 28, 1924.

Katie Starling to be postmaster at Walnut Grove, Miss. Office became presidential July 1, 1924.

Frances E. Clay to be postmaster at Vance, Miss. Office became presidential January 1, 1924.

John R. Trimm to be postmaster at Tishomingo, Miss. Office became presidential January 1, 1924.

David W. Gillis to be postmaster at Sledge, Miss. Office became presidential April 1, 1924.

Mary S. Graves to be postmaster at Roxie, Miss. Office became presidential July 1, 1924.

Elisha E. Petty to be postmaster at Pheba, Miss. Office became presidential October 1, 1923.

Minnie T. Brown to be postmaster at Ovet, Miss. Office became presidential October 1, 1924.

Allie B. Terry to be postmaster at New Augusta, Miss. Office became presidential October 1, 1924.

Josephine J. Dent to be postmaster at Morgan City, Miss. Office became presidential April 1, 1924.

Marcus B. Stroud to be postmaster at Louise, Miss. Office became presidential October 1, 1923.

Dan Cohn to be postmaster at Lorman, Miss. Office became presidential October 1, 1923.

William B. Stone to be postmaster at Fulton, Miss. Office became presidential October 1, 1923.

Aaron B. Johnston to be postmaster at Enid, Miss. Office became presidential October 1, 1923.

Joseph M. Scrivner to be postmaster at Derma, Miss. Office became presidential January 1, 1924.

Clarence L. Fleming to be postmaster at Crandall, Miss. Office became presidential July 1, 1924.

Victor B. Garraway to be postmaster at Bassfield, Miss. Office became presidential October 1, 1924.

James W. Gresham to be postmaster at Ashland, Miss. Office became presidential January 1, 1925.

#### NEW HAMPSHIRE

Blanche W. Drew to be postmaster at Intervale, N. H., in place of W. H. Drew, deceased.

#### NEBRASKA

John R. Bolte to be postmaster at Snyder, Nebr. Office became presidential October 1, 1923.

Cyril Svoboda to be postmaster at Prague, Nebr. Office became presidential October 1, 1924.

Ernest E. Goding to be postmaster at Dix, Nebr. Office became presidential October 1, 1924.

#### NORTH DAKOTA

Edwin O. Larson to be postmaster at Crosby, N. Dak., in place of E. O. Larson. Incumbent's commission expired January 23, 1924.

Carrie E. Kempshall to be postmaster at Taylor, N. Dak., in place of W. E. Kempshall, deceased.

Jacob Krier to be postmaster at Gladstone, N. Dak. Office became presidential April 1, 1923.

#### OKLAHOMA

James M. Baggett to be postmaster at Tuskahoma, Okla. Office became presidential October 1, 1924.

#### PENNSYLVANIA

Jeremiah H. Fetzer to be postmaster at Coopersburg, Pa., in place of J. H. Fetzer. Incumbent's commission expired April 13, 1924.

Arthur J. Davis to be postmaster at Noxen, Pa. Office became presidential January 1, 1925.

#### TEXAS

Raymund Mullen to be postmaster at Taft, Tex., in place of A. L. Williams, resigned.

Floyd W. Holder to be postmaster at Breckenridge, Tex., in place of G. R. McManis, resigned.

Elmer L. McFarland to be postmaster at Wingate, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1924.

#### WEST VIRGINIA

Delphy M. Legg to be postmaster at Fayetteville, W. Va., in place of J. S. Phipps, resigned.

John H. Shay to be postmaster at Star City, W. Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1924.

Alvin H. Perdew to be postmaster at Dorothy, W. Va. Office became presidential October 1, 1924.

#### WISCONSIN

Grace R. Morgan to be postmaster at Spring Green, Wis., in place of Thomas McNulty. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1924.

Lizzie J. Riley to be postmaster at Wilson, Wis. Office became presidential January 1, 1923.

## CONFIRMATIONS

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 12 (legislative day of February 5), 1925*

## POSTMASTERS

## ALABAMA

John W. Owen, Red Level.  
Rupert M. Bearden, West Blocton.

## CALIFORNIA

Eugene L. Ely, Kentfield.

## CONNECTICUT

S. Irving Frink, Brooklyn.

## MAINE

Nettie A. True, New Gloucester.

## OHIO

Cephas S. Littick, Dresden.  
George W. Overmyer, Lindsey.  
M. Virgil Smith, Proctorville.

## OKLAHOMA

Oscar F. Fowler, Redrock.

## OREGON

Theresa Scott, Jordan Valley.

## WASHINGTON

Ruth Randall, Prescott.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, February 12, 1925

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Have mercy upon us, O Lord, according to Thy loving kindness and our necessities. Impress us that usefulness and happiness are made secure only when eternal truth are held in reverence and everlasting laws obeyed. Speak to us as in the days of old, as in humility and yet in eagerness we wait for Thy blessing. Send us forth for a day of service that shall bring good to our country and reflect credit upon us as its chosen servants. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## CHINA TRADE ACT 1922

Mr. SNELL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (H. Res. 382) for the consideration of H. R. 7190, to amend the China trade act of 1922, which was referred to the House Calendar.

## VISÉ FEES.

Mr. SNELL, from the Committee on Rules, also submitted a privileged report (H. Res. 436) providing for the consideration of H. R. 11957, to authorize the President in certain cases to modify visé fees, which was referred to the House Calendar.

## HOBOKEN SHORE LINE

Mr. SNELL, from the Committee on Rules, also submitted a privileged report (H. Res. 437) providing for the consideration of S. 2287, to permit the Secretary of War to dispose of and the Port of New York Authority to acquire the Hoboken Shore Line, which was referred to the House Calendar.

## MIGRATORY BIRDS

Mr. SNELL, from the Committee on Rules, also submitted a privileged report (H. Res. 438) providing for the consideration of H. R. 745, for the establishment of migratory bird refuges, to furnish in perpetuity homes for migratory birds, the establishment of public-shooting grounds, to preserve the American system of free shooting, the provision of funds for establishing such areas, and the furnishing of adequate protection for migratory birds, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar.

## CHILD LABOR

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from the secretary of state of the State of Louisiana, announcing the rejection by the legislature of that State of the proposed amendment to the Constitution relating to child labor.

## DEPARTMENT OF STATE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. SHREVE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 11753) making

appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to all of the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. SHREVE, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. OLIVER of Alabama.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4024. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the admission of the State of California into the Union; and

S. 4120. An act to promote the production of sulphur upon the public domain.

The message also announced that the Senate insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5728) to amend the act of Congress of March 3, 1921, entitled "An act to amend section 3 of the act of Congress of June 28, 1906, entitled 'An act of Congress for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes,'" disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and had appointed Mr. HARRELD, Mr. McNARY, and Mr. OWEN as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 11753) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees indicated below:

S. 4024. An act to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of seventy-fifth anniversary of the admission of the State of California into the Union; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

S. 4120. An act to promote the production of sulphur upon the public domain; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

## LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 12101) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1926, and for other purposes, and pending that motion I ask the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] whether he will consent to an extension of time for general debate for 1 hour, 30 minutes of which time shall be controlled by myself and 30 minutes by him.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That will be agreeable to me.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be extended for one hour, one-half to be controlled by myself and one-half by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the legislative appropriation bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BANKHEAD) there were—ayes 72, noes 0.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum. The Door-keeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the legislative appropriation bill.